



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

Fourth Session

Number 66

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable P.J. McNicholas

Thursday

30 June 1988

The House met at 2:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

MR. TULK:
A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, I think what I am going to say is a legitimate point of order and therefore should be heard.

It has to do with the procedure we may or may not be following in this House sometime this afternoon. It had to do with the Notice of Motion given yesterday by the Government House Leader (Mr. Simms) which could conceivably see us into a procedure this afternoon where we are in a closure position in the legislature. Everybody knows it is a good parliamentary rule, but it is a very serious one which interferes in some ways with the normal course of debate.

MR. PATTERSON:
C.D. Howe introduced closure on the pipeline debate in Ottawa.

MR. TULK:
Yes, C.D. Howe introduced closure on the pipeline debate in Ottawa and the seriousness of the matter was pointed out in that particular case because it is a fact of political history that a government led by a Liberal leader at that point in time lost an election, I believe, because of the closure rules. I make that point to the hon. gentleman.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:
What is your point of order?

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, my point of order is this: The Government House Leader feels this closure motion has to be introduced in order that he might get Supply, that he might have money to pay civil servants, to pay widows and so on. That was the gist of his remarks yesterday evening, this had to be done because the government was running out of cash.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the hon. gentleman that closure in this case is not necessary because if the hon. gentleman wants to introduce a bill this afternoon giving further Interim Supply for a couple of weeks, the Opposition is prepared to do so.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the President of the Council, to the point of order.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker, to the point of order, obviously the Liberal Party continues to play a charade with the people of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

It is absolutely a sham because they know or they should know, perhaps they do not know, perhaps they should know, it is just not a matter of bringing in a bill for Interim Supply for a week or two weeks. There is a considerable amount of work done in preparing The Interim Supply Bill, in fact, weeks of it. I guess by the time you contact all the government

departments and seek the amount they require, what they would need, I mean, it is just not a simple matter. So that is such a silly kind of comment, but it fits in so well with their particular approach on these matters and in this particular matter.

I can assure the hon. member if that is the kind of co-operation he is suggesting, we are not interested in that because it cannot work, it does not work, and it will not work.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:
There is no point of order, obviously.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

That is purely a hypothetical position and a matter that can be dealt with at the time. There is certainly no point of order.

Statements by Ministers

MR. MATTHEWS:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. MATTHEWS:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Today I am announcing 147 projects to be funded under this year's Private Sector Employment Program.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MATTHEWS:
These 147 projects involve a provincial contribution of \$434,858 employing 192 individuals and an additional total of \$70,090 employing 82 students.

To date, Mr. Speaker, approximately \$6.52 million has been spent to create 2,597 jobs, 805 of which are student positions. I would also like to indicate that 1,234 businesses from approximately 265 communities in this Province have applied for and received funding through this Private Sector Employment Program, 265 communities, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. MATTHEWS:
This in itself is an indication of the success of this program.

Mr. Speaker, at this point all funding has been allocated through the regular process, although additional projects maybe announced throughout the Summer as slippage occurs. The final announcements on those programs should see the creation of our goal, Mr. Speaker, of 3,000 jobs.

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:
In the absence of my colleague for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) I want to make a few brief comments about this statement by the minister today. It seems to be done on a weekly basis so I am wondering if it has anything to do

with our 10/42 Lotto we hear about from week to week in which jobs are created for ten weeks and then we have forty-two weeks of unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, while this project is now coming to an end, there is a question to be asked. The minister, I am sure, has been asked this before, but the House needs a report and so do the people of the Province. While \$6.52 million has been spent on the creation of jobs, we were led to believe, Mr. Speaker, that these jobs are created and they are permanent jobs, and they are not just going to be reinstated next year.

This was initiated last year, Mr. Speaker, and again this year, the year of 1988, and to date we have seen no report. We have asked the minister this question and we would like, at some point in time, for the hon. minister to be able -- if he could listen and keep his colleagues quite he would hear, and I am sure the minister has a job hearing, but it is a very serious question.

At some point in time, I am sure his department would do a study to check and actually see how many firms have done the hiring through the private sector cost sharing program for last year and this year have kept the people have kept them on after the project and its government funding has run out? I am sure the minister must be concerned about this and so we are concerned.

AN HON. MEMBER:

One hundred per cent of them.

MR. EFFORD:

If it is 100 per cent, it is great. I am sure the government

do not want to go through this same project again next year and put the same amount of money in to re-hire the same number of people. We have no argument with the government creating jobs. It is good for the people of this Province and especially good for the students coming out of university and trade school to be able to avail of Summer employment. But the main issue here are the permanent jobs that are suppose to be created and supposed to be kept on after the program is terminated. That is the question. At some point, Mr. Speaker, before Regatta Day, before the House of Assembly closes during the middle of August, could we get an answer on that?

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, on April 28, I was pleased to be able to provide this House with an update with respect to government's involvement with loan guarantees as they related to fish companies. At that time I indicated that we had extended and provided guarantees on behalf of ten companies, totalling approximately \$3 million. This assistance impacted positively upon approximately 1,200 jobs, and I am pleased to advise this House today that we have provided or extended assistance on behalf of four additional companies totalling \$3,280,000. This

additional assistance should impact positively on another 500 plant workers.

In addition to the 1,200 plant workers directly affected in my earlier announcement, Mr. Speaker, the companies involved are as follows:

1. Torrent Fisheries Limited, \$80,000. This new guarantee will enable this company to operate the fish plant at Hawke's Bay, provided badly needed employment for eighty plant workers.

2. Petty Harbour Fish Producers Co-operative Society Limited, \$1,100,000. This Co-op has worked well to advance the interest of the inshore fishermen of Petty Harbour. Government's assistance will be of direct benefit to approximately ninety plant workers and the fishermen of Petty Harbour who also sell their catch to the Co-op.

3. George Dawe and Sons Limited, Port de Grave, \$100,000. This extension of the company's two \$50,000 guarantees will enable it to continue with its saltfish operation on the Island and on the Labrador Coast providing an outlet to fishermen and also much needed employment for approximately thirty plant workers.

4. Notre Dame Bay Fisheries Limited, Comfort Cove, \$2 million. Government recently extended this company's guarantees of \$1 million each, thereby enabling it to continue with its multi-species operation which in peak periods provides employment to over 300 plant workers. This operation is open for the better part of a year operating some nine to ten months annually.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to improve and develop the fabric of rural Newfoundland then we must have a vibrant fishing industry. I am confident that our assistance in the form of loan guarantees, which does not involve direct cash outlays, will enable the companies I have mentioned today and in my previous Ministerial Statement to develop and prosper to the extent that government assistance will no longer be required.

Our commitment to rural Newfoundland is indisputable and it is clearly indicated in the increased assistance which I have announced today.

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, if the loan guarantees the minister has announced today are absolutely necessary, if the benefits to be derived by virtue of these loan guarantees being given are as the minister indicates, and if all of the requirements are met, and I presume they are, then, of course, members on this side welcome the announcement; we have nothing at all against making loan guarantees available for the development of our fishery.

Mr. Speaker, some of the figures mentioned by the minister are interesting. He says a loan guarantee of roughly \$3 million will impact on 500 plant workers in the Province. Of course, I cannot let the opportunity go by without once again reminding the

minister that if the same criteria were applied, if the money we have put in Sprung was put in fisheries development, it would probably provide anywhere from 2,000 to 3,000 jobs, which, I think, again points out just how crazy the Sprung thing is.

Mr. Speaker, I am very interested here in the one for George Dawe and Sons. That money is being made available, or is a guarantee, to enable the company to get further involved in the salt fish business, and I think that is a good thing. Certainly, with the glut of cod fish we now have the Province, it seems to me that one of the answers to the problem is to encourage people to salt their fish, and, of course, by making this loan guarantee available to George Dawe and Sons, which of course, is a well-known salt fish producing company, then indirectly they are contributing to alleviating the glut problem. Of course, we cannot fault them for doing that.

Mr. Speaker, item number four in the minister's statement, Nortre Dame Bay Fisheries, Comfort Cove, again a very fine company operated by a fine family, Lou Eveleigh and his sons, it seems to me that this is the second time that has been announced, and I am wondering if the minister is not trying to play games. I hope he is not. Maybe he is not. If he is not, I apologize.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, we do welcome the statement. In closing, I would like to remind the minister of the promise made by his colleague, the Minister of Career Development,

that they would table information dealing with the Ting acquisition, the leasing of the Ting plant. He promised to table all the transactions on that deal.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

Oral Questions

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Justice (Ms Verge) I would like to pose a question to the Deputy Premier (Dr. Collins). It refers to the Fowler Report from the judicial inquiry into the fire at Badger Lake, in Catamaran Provincial Park. He will know, as it was tabled last week, that the judge says 'the cause of the forest fire was due to hot material being projected by a West-bound extra freight train being negligently operated by CN Terra-Transport.'

MR. CALLAN:
That is why we closed down the railway.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker, it may be funny to hon. members opposite but it is not funny to the sixteen families who lost over \$700,000 worth of property. I ask the Deputy Premier, in all seriousness - if you can keep the Minister of Tourism (Mr. Barrett) who is back from Japan quiet for two minutes -

MR. BARRETT:
I have not been there.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. FUREY:
Oh, pick any country, then.

I ask the Deputy Premier will government be seeking compensation from CN in light of Judge Fowler's findings, and in light of the destruction of over \$700,000 worth of private property by this company's negligence, and, as well, by the near destruction of another piece of public property known as Catamaran Park? Will the government be seeking compensation from CN immediately?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, I believe that certain aspects of this matter are still before the courts in some respect so one has to be careful of this matter. I think the basic facts are clear. The people have been aggrieved, they have lost property, there is recourse available to them, and I am sure that the report that came in will be very useful to those people who might be claimants. Now, there have been certain representations made to their representatives, certain requests have been made and these are being followed up. I can assure the hon member, and assure this House, that we are very sympathetic towards these property owners in the Province and we are making whatever efforts that can be made at this point in time, but there are certain aspects that have not cleared the court procedure totally as yet.

MR. FUREY:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:
Notwithstanding, Mr. Speaker, the damage private property owners suffered, I ask the minister with respect to the public property, since Catamaran Park was devastated, nearly destroyed completely, will the government be seeking financial compensation to restore that park to its original beauty?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, that is another aspect to it, but it is a very serious and important aspect. I will particularly take notice of that question and try to get as many details as possible on it and bring them back to the House.

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A final supplementary, the hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker, Judge Fowler's report lays out specific recommendations, as the government will know because these specific recommendations were tabled in this House.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. FUREY:
I ask the Deputy Premier, in the absence of the Justice Minister, will the government be acting upon those recommendations, specifically with respect to a policeman who has knowledge of the forest industry, and the one

concerning the CN employees who were under stress when they were testifying at these hearings? Will the government be acting upon those recommendations, specifically two and three, immediately?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, I said I would take that question and matters related to under notice. The hon. Minister of Justice has already laid out certain facts in the matter and I am sure that all other aspects of it will be similarly investigated.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Power).

MR. POWER:
Not again!

MR. KELLAND:
Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, I asked the minister a series of questions, and he was not specific in his answers. But one point came through pretty clearly, and that was that it is no concern of his as a minister, or of the government, that mechanics liens are being taken out against Sprung, and no concern of his that the subcontractors were not being paid. Now I ask him to tell me quite clearly and distinctly is that his personal ministerial

policy and the policy of government, that you have no concern in this matter?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. POWER:
Mr. Speaker, there is never any distinction between the personal feelings of ministers and what ministers say as government policy. They are, in effect, one and the same. In this area, when I say 'concern of government,' we do not have any legal, binding, contractual commitments with any of the subcontractors. In this Province, and in many other places in the free world, there is a system whereby when government commissions some work to be done there is a general contractor used.

If the Government of Newfoundland, or any company or corporation that used a general contractor was going to then try and decide, settle, arbitrate, or umpire disputes between subcontractors and the general contractor, then I suspect there would not be very much done in this Province.

We had a contract with a general contractor. To our satisfaction that contract has been fulfilled. The dispute between the subcontractors and the general contractor will have to take the normal courses that are involved in a free world.

MR. KELLAND:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A supplementary, the hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe that the minister is saying, that government has no business being concerned with this. I am not talking about the legal aspect, but the minister has a moral obligation to the people of this Province. And I ask how can he justify ignoring that moral obligation to the people he represents, who own 50 percent of the company?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, obviously it has nothing to do with government's lack of concern. I just said we do not have a financial responsibility, a financial concern as it relates. The participants in the company the member asked me about yesterday are very good friends of mine, but they have a problem with a general contractor with whom they signed a contract. It is now in the legal, judicial process of this Province for them to get a settlement. If the government was to interfere in every dispute between every subcontractor and general contractor, then I do not know why we have gone to all the trouble of having mechanics liens and a whole range of laws in this Province. That is what they are there for, to settle those kind of disputes. This government has no intention of getting involved either in this issue with Sprung or with any other general contractor in a dispute with a subcontractor.

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary.

MR. KELLAND:

There is no way the government cannot be concerned and there is no way it is none of government's business what is happening over there, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask him a final supplementary. What about the Newfoundland contractors you just spoke of? Are you not concerned that they are not being paid?

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, all the subcontractors in the Province deal with general contractors in a whole range of things. Yesterday I had one of my friends, a constituent from Kilbride, who called me with a dispute between a subcontractor and a highroads project. Now how do I or the government go out and settle a dispute between our general contractor, who has a tender from the government, and in that general contract they let a subcontract to get some hydroseeding done or some guardrail put up? Are we supposed to interfere every day in a legitimate agreement between a government and a contractor? And then when there is some subcontracting, are we also supposed to go out and be responsible for that? The reality is, Mr. Speaker, that in the Province we have a system whereby any subcontractor who works for a general contractor, who has a tender from government, has a mechanism whereby they can access

the courts, access the Mechanic Liens Act, and they get their just desserts as it relates in the court itself. We have no intention of in government, in the case of Sprung or anything else, to get involved with subcontractors. It is not government's responsibility. Yes, we are concerned, but at the same time we have a contract and those contractual obligations have been fulfilled.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, my question goes to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) and it concerns the caplin fishery which ended for the purse seine fishermen last midnight in Notre Dame Bay. Mr. Speaker, I know the minister will remind me of the quota that has been agreed to between the Japanese and the industry, and the importance of staying within that quota. But, Mr. Speaker, my question to the minister is posed in light of reports that I received today from fishermen in my district, as has the hon. the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) and I believe, the hon. the member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford), to the effect that caplin are plentiful, the quality is excellent and the Japanese buyers have been telling these fishermen that additional markets exist for additional caplin over and above the quota. Given all these facts and the fact that caplin this year is a very lucrative business, would the

minister undertake to discuss with his federal counterpart, and again with due regard for the quota, the possibility of maybe extending the season to give the fishermen a chance to cash in on what in most areas have been a bonanza this year?

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries,

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I want to now, very clearly, remind the House what the hon. gentleman is asking me to do. The Newfoundland processors and the representatives of the Japanese importers negotiated a contract for 1988 of approximately 30,000 tons with a commitment from the Japanese that if production for their market was held to that amount then they would commit to take a minimum of 25,000 tons in 1989. That is the first time we have ever had that long-term commitment from the Japanese. Now, we are all for, and we will facilitate, the filling of other market opportunities, whether those market opportunities are in Taiwan, the Soviet Union, China or wherever. We will facilitate the opening of the caplin fishery to facilitate other market opportunities, but what we will not do, Mr. Speaker, is facilitate the opening of the caplin fishery to glut the market in Japan for the shortterm, in 1988, with the possibility that they will not honour their commitment to us for 1989. We will open the caplin fishery after it closes down if there are other market opportunities available in other countries, for pet food, for zoo food, or aquaculture food in China, in Hong Kong, in Taiwan, or

anywhere, but Japan is closing at 30,000 tons.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Twillingate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, in the preamble to my question I made reference to the quota and I also stressed the importance of staying within that quota. Unless existing quotas are available then close the fishery. Mr. Speaker, the information I have is that there are additional markets for caplin.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. W. CARTER:

My question to the minister: Given the fact, Mr. Speaker, that there appears to be other markets, given the fact that the Japanese have expressed an interest in acquiring caplin over and above the agreed on quota, given all these facts, I ask the minister, again, would he talk to his federal counterpart with a view to having the season extended, thereby filling the markets that are alleged to be there for additional caplin?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, there are some very fancy words in the hon.

gentleman's question, some very fancy words in the hon. gentleman's question! Mr. Speaker, the first part of the hon. gentleman's question is that Japanese buyers still want to buy and will we facilitate that. I have said, categorically, no, we will not facilitate that. We have an agreement between the Japanese importers and the Newfoundland processors at 30,000 tons, and based on that they have given us a commitment of 25,000 tons for 1989, an agreement we never had before in our history, Mr. Speaker. That is stability and I do not intend to jeopardize that stability. That is double, by the way, what we had last year, coming off the madness of 1986, so I do not intend to jeopardize that. Now, the other part of the hon. gentleman's question is sensible. If there are other market opportunities, after the Japanese production and quota and contracts have been filled at 30,000 tons, if there are other opportunities, and I understand there are other opportunities in Taiwan and maybe China and some other places for aquaculture food, pet food, and so on, then every living market opportunity should be filled, but we cannot cut off our nose to spite our face in Japan, which is still the most important market opportunity that we have.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, my fancy words are necessary when you are dealing

with a minister and a government so anxious to twist and distort, as the minister endeavored to do with respect to my first question.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, would the minister then tell the House what initiatives he has taken in recent days to discover or to identify new markets, forgetting the Japanese markets, in China or Taiwan or Hong Kong, and what has he done about finding new markets where the fishermen can sell their caplin this year?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:
To the hon. gentleman's preamble, the master of twisting and distortion is over there, Mr. Speaker. I was replying to the very nice words, Will you let Japan buy a little bit more because there are Japanese buyers out there saying they can take more, and there are Newfoundland fishermen who will sell to them? Mr. Speaker, that is a recipe for disaster. The Japanese buyers will buy until we shut them down. The Japanese Importers Association know they will do that, and that is why they want the Government of Newfoundland and the Government of Canada to control production for that very delicate Japanese market. I have said to the hon. gentleman that there are other market opportunities. We will close down the caplin fishery when the Japanese production has been met. We will open it up again for other market opportunities that I know exist, that we have been working on, that other processors in this Province have been working

on, and there are probably several thousand tons more of caplin that can be taken. But what we have to ensure is that they go to the right place, not find a backdoor, through Taiwan, perhaps, and into Japan for another 5,000 or 6,000 tons, which will kill us next year, not find a backdoor through Hong Kong or into Japan, which will kill us next year. We will open it up for other confirmed market opportunities where there are guarantees existing that the caplin will not get into Japan and crucify us in 1989.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, my question is also to the Minister of Fisheries. I have to agree with the Minister of Fisheries, he is quite right to protect the markets in Japan. And I would ask the minister, in light of the fact that he had this caplin study done last year, which, by the way, is an excellent study, is he aware that most caplin fishermen in and around Conception Bay have not made much money on caplin this year, due to the fact that the caplin season opened before they were ripe enough to process, and that the large seiners brought this caplin in, and sold it to a few fish plants, which is going to destroy the caplin fishery for next year?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, indeed I am aware. I

was so much aware, Mr. Speaker, that I personally took it on myself to try to get the representative of the fishermen, which is the union in this case, and representatives of the processors, which would have been FANL, and the Caplin Exporters Association to agree on a percentage red feed and therefore not to fish the caplin until that percentage red feed was made. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the people involved in the industry would not agree to set up that kind of mechanism.

MR. EFFORD:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary.

MR. EFFORD:

Is it not the Provincial Minister of Fisheries, in conjunction with the Federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Siddon), who put the regulations in place set the date when the caplin fishery opens and closes? How can you blame it on the fishermen? Naturally the fishermen, in desperation to earn money, are going to catch the caplin, but you impose the regulations. You are supposed to put the law in place.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

The hon. gentleman shows an abysmal lack of the management of fisheries' policies in this Province. The fact of the matter is that seasons are opened at a particular time. The caplin season - I do not know is June 12 or June 20. Something of that nature is the normal opening time. Fishermen and processors then agree when the caplin is ripe

for taking. Nobody has to go and take it on the day it opens. The caplin are not going to go away, they are not going to disappear, they will be around for several weeks. What has failed to transpire, Mr. Speaker, is that both sides of the industry have failed to agree on a mechanism defining when caplin are ready to be harvested, and neither side wants government to impose that regulation on them. They have not been able to agree among themselves on when it is appropriate to do it and what the percentage of red feed is. And even though I personally tried on a Saturday afternoon to get them to agree, they were not able to agree, Mr. Speaker.

MR. EFFORD:

A final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary.

MR. EFFORD:

Let me say to the Minister of Fisheries I have forgotten more about the caplin fishery than the hon. the Minister of Fisheries will ever know.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. EFFORD:

Is the Minister of Fisheries standing in this House this afternoon -

MR. PEACH:

Put your fishing licence on the table.

MR. EFFORD:

I got one, you need not worry about that, and I do not mind

admitting it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. EFFORD:

Let me ask the Minister of Fisheries is it not the responsibility of the Provincial Government in conjunction with the Federal government to impose regulations so that the fishermen will be protected, the same way as they regulate the size of boats, the same way they regulate the lobster catch, the same way they regulate salmon catch? Is that not the responsibility of the Minister of Fisheries and the federal minister?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I can only say to the hon. gentleman that unlike him I do not profess to be a self-proclaimed expert. I can only say to him that it is some hard to be humble.

On the other hand I can say to the hon. gentleman that I do not know if he is in a conflict of interest or not asking those questions about red feed content and all that kind of stuff. The third thing I will say to the hon. gentleman is that we impose production controls on caplin after consultation and consensus with the fishermen, with the processors, and with the importers. Mr. Speaker, we have gone a long way from the chaotic days of 1986 when nothing was in place, a long, long way, and most reasonable people out there will agree to that. We will also

impose a regulation on red feed content if and when the industry gets its own house in order and agrees with us on a percentage. We are not going to shove something down their throat that the fishermen will crucify the government for on one hand and that the processors will crucify the government for on the other. We will do it when there is consensus and after the appropriate consultation, but we will not do it arbitrarily, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LONG:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. John's East.

MR. LONG:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question today for the Minister Responsible for Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Dawe) in the absence of the Premier. It is not unrelated to recent action, taken, in fact, yesterday, by the city council of St. John's concerning its potential relations as a municipality with the government of South Africa, and an expression of its own disagreement with the apartheid. I would like to ask the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs is he aware that this evening an official representative, namely the Consul from the South African Embassy in Ottawa, will be having a meeting with a group of private citizens in St. John's and whether any representatives of this government will be involved in this meeting?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker, this answer will be relatively short compared to the question. I will have to take it under advisement at the present time. I am not aware of anyone from government who is officially attending that particular meeting.

MR. LONG:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. John's East.

MR. LONG:

I would like to ask the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs a supplementary that he may also, perhaps, take under advisement, if he does not feel like making a comment today with respect to the government's position. In view of the fact that this government some years ago banned the sale of South African wines and brandies in liquor stores, will the minister give a commitment that the government will consider action similar to that taken by the city of St. John's, in particular to refuse the protocol office of this government, or any ministers or department, to have any truck or trade with officials of the South African government who may be coming from the Embassy or who might be private representatives from South Africa?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker, I will certainly have to take that under advisement and get back to the hon. member in due course.

MR. LONG:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for St. John's East.

MR. LONG:

I would like to ask a final supplementary of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Windsor), if he would be willing to address an issue which would come under his jurisdiction with respect to this issue. My question would be whether the Minister of Finance has in the past, or is currently considering giving instruction to the managers of the Province's investment funds, in particular the pooled pension funds, to ensure that no investment monies that belong to the government and the people of this Province are being invested in South African corporations?

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Finance.

MR. MORGAN:

He does not have to answer.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

I recognize the hon. the member for Fogo.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LONG:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker. I do not think the Minister of Finance heard the question asked of him?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

He does not have to answer.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

An hon. minister does not have to

answer a question if he does not want to do so.

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

That is right, and he did not answer it.

MR. SIMMS:

Take it under advisement and answer later on.

MR. WINDSOR:

I thought he was talking to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. TULK:

Go ahead.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. WINDSOR:

If he wants to repeat it I will try to answer.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. John's East.

MR. LONG:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question was has the Minister of Finance or officials of his department in the past given instructions to the managers of our pooled pension funds or any other investment funds to ensure that no monies belonging to the people of this Province invested abroad are invested in South African corporations?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

MR. WINDSOR:

No, Mr. Speaker, I have not given any such instructions. We have a full committee of professionals

who are mandated to deal with our pension investment funds and do so, and report from time to time. I doubt very much that they have invested in any South African companies. I will look into it and will take it under advisement.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries and it relates to a question that he just answered for the member for Twillingate. He said, and we agree with him, that with the Japanese markets you should meet your quotas and stop. But he also made the statement that he will be allowing fishermen, hopefully, to access some other markets. Out of concern for those fishermen who reach their quota at midnight, I ask him when will they be able to access those markets this year? Will it be tomorrow, two weeks, or a month's time?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, after it has been determined that the Japanese production has been reached and the fishery is then closed down, then processors who have confirmed contracts. And there are a number of them, some who have confirmed contracts with Taiwan and some who have confirmed contracts for pet food, and some who have confirmed contracts for aquaculture food - I understand there are some market potential with contracts being put in place for China. Barry's out in Corner Brook, for example, are saying that they have additional confirmed contracts for male caplin only with the Soviet Union - so once the Japanese production

is over and out of the way, Mr. Speaker, the Caplin Mangement Committee will then make a decision on what additional tonnage can be permitted to be caught for those additional contracts that are in place and are legitimate, and the fishery will then be allowed to reopen. But we have to make sure is that we do not allow a reopening to get caplin through the backdoor into Japan.

MR. TULK:

How long do you think it will take?

MR. RIDFOUT:

I think it is only a matter of a day or two, really. I mean, Federal Fisheries are on top of this with our department. In fact, there is a call here that came in since Question Period for me to call the Federal Minister, who wants to talk to me about caplin. Obviously, the caplin are not going to stay around forever, and if fishermen are going to take advantage of any additional market opportunity they will have to get cracking. I mean, what we want to achieve here is make sure we do not jeopardize the market in Japan, get that over with, get it closed, get it behind us, and then open up again for whatever else might be available.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Fisheries and it is in relation to the much talked about late Spring storm which resulted in extensive damage to fishing gear on the Northeast

Coast. Is the minister aware of fishermen's discontent and dissatisfaction and total frustration with assessment levels and procedures employed by both levels of government? Is the minister aware that up to this point in time fishermen are totally confused and uncertain with respect to compensation for their lost gear, lobster pots, codtraps and lump nets? So can the minister address these two items specifically with respect to the assessments and with respect to compensation that fishermen might expect to receive for their lost gears as a result of the storm damage?

MR. RIDFOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDFOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. gentleman for his question. I think we had questions on this particular matter in the House some time ago. I cannot speak for federal assessments, I do not know what kind of assessments were done by the Federal Department of Fisheries and who did them. I can speak for the Provincial Department of Fisheries, and we did a community by community, Fishermen's Committee by Fishermen's Committee assessment of every community along the Northeast Coast that reported storm damage, in the hon. gentleman's area, in the Fogo area, in my own area, and those detailed field assessments as provided to us by individual fishermen and as provided to us by the Chairman of Fishermen's Committees show conclusively and beyond a doubt that while the storm damage was significant it

was not of the proportions that had been anticipated and talked about a few days following the storm damage itself. That is point number one.

Point number two, Mr. Speaker, is that most of the damage was confined to two pieces of harvesting equipment, either lobster pots or lump roe nets. We have a program of replacement and assistance for replacing lobster pots to fishermen. Most of the fishermen did not avail of that particular program for a couple of reasons, one, a lot of fishermen make sure that they have a few extra pots in the Spring anyway rather than coming into the government bank where they have to pay \$7. And secondly, of course, the lobster season was starting to gear down and there was more concentration on caplin.

In terms of lump roe, we do not have a program for replacement of lump roe nets. It is a very difficult thing to get into because lump roe nets are normally set in very shallow water and, if there is much of a breeze at all, it is quite common to lose lump roe nets. I am sure the hon. gentleman understands that.

For codtrap parts we have replacement program. Gillnets, there were very few gillnets lost, by the way, according the surveys, but we do have 500 nets and we have invited fishermen who are in need of them to let our field officers know and we will attempt to distribute them as fairly and as best we can.

So that is the information we have, Mr. Speaker: While the losses were significant and we have some programs to address them, the significance of the loss

was not as great as had originally had been talked about the first two or three days or the first week following the damage.

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A supplementary, the hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker, I asked the minister is he aware that the reason why the replacement program was not availed of to the extent that he would have thought is because of the tremendous financial plight that these fishermen find themselves, Mr. Speaker. They lost gear which they were paying for this year, and when you combine this with previous indebtedness they could not afford to take on any other extra financial obligations, be they large or small. Is the minister aware of this?

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, I am aware that in the case of lump fish nets that is a fact. Many of the fishermen who lost lump fish nets had them through some kind of a financial arrangement with a supplier or the fish processor or whatever. And as I said quite frankly upfront, we do not have a program to respond to the loss of lump fish nets. However, in terms of lobster pots and codtrap parts and the experimental gillnet program that the department operates, then it was certainly made clear to fishermen that if they wanted to

avail of that program that the department would be very flexible in making sure that there was a way found for them to avail of the program, even though our guidelines suggest that we want to get the money upfront. But it was certainly made known to fishermen that we would be flexible in that approach with them if they wanted to avail of those programs.

However, I suspect that they got into the caplin after that and maybe some of them might be back after the caplin is over, I do not know. But in terms of lump fish nets, the hon. gentleman is correct. No doubt many of those were purchased under financial arrangements outside with local people, and I quite frankly admit that we do not have a program to help that out.

MR. LUSH:
A final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

Notices of Motion

MR. WINDSOR:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Finance.

MR. WINDSOR:
Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow move that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole on Supply to consider certain resolutions for the granting of further Supplementary Supply to Her Majesty.

Answers to Questions for which Notice has been Given

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, I took notice of a question asked by the hon. the member for Port de Grave yesterday in regard to food services at the Central Newfoundland Hospital. At that time, in responding I indicated I thought his particular query just would not hold up to investigation, but I did say I would look into it and that has turned out to be the case.

The fact of the matter is, in December of last year the Department of Health was informed that because of renovations, there would be a problem in regards to the use of kitchen facilities out there. At the time, there was not a particular person on staff at the hospital who would take this on in a knowledgeable way. There were moves made, and a Director of Dietetic Services - I think that is his title. It might be a slightly different title, but, anyway, that is exactly what his job is - was appointed - I think it was in early February - and his particular and first task was to solve this problem, and it was done by that particular part of the administration at the hospital. We assisted, obviously, but it was initiated and carried forward by the people at the hospital.

Now, the hon. member has a silly grin on his face. I do not know if that means he does not believe this, but I am just telling the

Facts. I do not lie in the House of Assembly, I tell the facts in the House of Assembly.

Anyway, that particular individual, with the assistance of the Department of Health, made strenuous moves. Local possibilities were contacted, such as Carmelite House, to see if they could supply it, three of the national firms who supply food to hospitals were contacted. Versa Foods and Nova. I forget the name of third one. Anyway, there were three who supply food to hospitals. They could not manage it. There was an attempt made to find what is called a truck or field kitchen. There was none available in the Atlantic area. They looked into setting up a tent kitchen, but that would not pass health regulations. It was considered whether a temporary kitchen would be constructed for this purpose, but it was clear that this would not be able to be done in an adequate way in the time frame available. Contact was made with the Health Sciences Complex here in St. John's, to see if they could supply hospital food services, which would involve freezing foods, transporting them out, having a heating arrangement, and so on and so forth.

So these very extensive moves were made. Finally, a contract was successfully concluded with a firm in Gander, Westons, who have undertaken to supply the food. As I say, this was initiated, but also agreed to, by all people concerned, the hospital, the Department of Health and the supplier.

We have made specific enquiries, and to my knowledge, the food has been very successfully supplied, there have been no difficulties.

The administration say they are extremely happy with the service. I am not saying that everyone in the hospital likes the food. I have never seen a hospital yet, or, indeed, I have never seen an institution yet where everyone likes the food. But the hospital has assured us that this is a mechanism that is working extremely well, and it is as acceptable as the food services have ever been in the hospital.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Orders of the Day

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to call Motion 11, which is the motion that debate on Motion 1 shall not be further adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER:

The motion is 'That further consideration of any resolution or resolutions, clause or clauses, section or sections, preamble or preambles, title or titles, or whatever else might be related to Motion No. 1 shall be the first business of the House, when next called by the House, and shall not be further postponed.'

All those in favor, please say, 'aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Aye.

MR. SPEAKER:

Those against 'nay'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Nay.

MR. SPEAKER:

Carried.

MR. TULK:
Division.

Division

MR. SPEAKER:
Call in the members.

Is the House ready for the question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
All those in favour of the motion, please rise:

The hon. the Minister of Finance and Minister Responsible for Labrador Hydro (Mr. Windsor), The hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout), the hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services (Dr. Twomey), the hon. the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn), the hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Power), the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources (Mr. R. Aylward), the hon. the President of Treasury Board and President of the Council (Mr. Simms), the hon. the Minister of Health (Dr. Collins), the hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Dawe), the hon. the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Doyle), the hon. the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Matthews), the hon. the Minister of Environment and Lands (Mr. Russell), the hon. the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard), the hon. the Minister of Development and Tourism (Mr. Barrett), the hon. the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Tobin), the hon. the Minister Responsible for Northern Development (Mr. Warren), the hon. the Minister Responsible

for Newfoundland and Labrador Housing (Mr. Peach), Mr. Parsons, Mr. Greening, Mr. J. Carter, Mr. Baird, Mr. Hodder, Mr. Woodford, Mr. Callan, Mr. Patterson.

MR. SPEAKER:
All those against the motion, please rise:

The Hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Wells), Mr. Efford, the hon. Mr. Simmons, Mr. Tulk, Mr. Baker, Mr. W. Carter, Mr. Gilbert, Mr. K. Aylward, Mr. Kelland, Mr. Furey, Mr. Lush, Mr. Gullage, Mr. Fenwick, Mr. Long.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The motion is carried, twenty-five for and fourteen against.

MR. SIMMS:
I call Motion 1, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Motion 1.

All hon. members know that each member will have twenty minutes to speak.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. WELLS:
Mr. Speaker, I probably will not need twenty minutes to finish what I have to say.

MR. PATTERSON:
You are finished period.

MR. WELLS:
I will almost certainly need it if hon. gentlemen opposite keep up that racket. I am sure to need it.

Mr. Speaker, I needed only a few more minutes to finish the points I wished to make on the amendment,

but now that we are really debating the budget in the framework of closure, I also want to take a few minutes to say that a government that does not call the Budget Debate for two full months, from April 26, when it was last called, by which time Opposition members had spent less than five hours debating it - there were some members spoke on the government side of the House, but Opposition members had spent less than five hours on the Budget debate, which is the major debate of any session of this House, Mr. Speaker, and the government called the motion again -

MR. J. CARTER:
That is not true.

MR. WELLS:
It is. It is factual. It is taken from the House records.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. WELLS:
It is government's responsibility to run the House and put government business through the House in a proper and orderly fashion, and having sat on it for two full months, then they call it on June 28 and the President of the Council and Government House Leader stands and talks about a filibuster. Two speakers, the hon. the member for St. Barbe and myself had spoken, and the hon. the President of the Council stands and talks about a filibuster. So it is necessary to bring in closure to stop the government filibuster.

MR. TULK:
There is another word for it. It

is called mismanagement.

MR. WELLS:
In heaven's name, who in this Province does he expect to believe that nonsense? Also, who is going to believe that the government money runs out at midnight on June 30? That also is not accurate. Because, Mr. Speaker, in Interim Supply a sum of money was voted, not a specified number of days of spending power. It may well be that the authority is already run out. It may well be that they have overrun already.

MR. PATTERSON:
A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the member for Placentia.

MR. PATTERSON:
A point of information. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition -

MR. WELLS:
A point of information is not in order.

MR. PATTERSON:
A point of order.

MR. FUREY:
Sit down! Sit down!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

A point of order.

MR. PATTERSON:
The hon. Leader mentioned that the government funding runs out tonight at 1:00 o'clock. I would like to know when his funding runs out. When do they stop getting brown envelopes?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

There is no point of order.

MR. WELLS:
And the children are very happy. They are satisfied with the Kindergarten performance. They are amused. But I can tell those hon. members that the 18,000 people they have driven out of this Province are not amused, nor are their relatives, nor are the 30,000 they put below the poverty line, nor are the other 22,000 they put on the unemployment insurance rolls. None of them are amused, and they will all be votes against the government when they get the guts to call the election.

MR. TULK:
Right on.

MR. SIMMONS:
It will not be long now.

MR. WELLS:
Indeed it will not be long now. It will happen very soon now.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to get back to the motion. Mr. Speaker, nobody is going to believe that nonsense from the government. I do not know how much of the total sum that was authorized on Interim Supply in March has in fact been spent. If it has in fact all been spent, we have offered to provide further Interim Supply; we did it two days ago, and the House Leader could have had it available.

MR. SIMMS:
It takes two weeks to put it together. Do not be so stunned.

MR. WELLS:

Well, in that case they should resign immediately, if they cannot put that together in less than two days. If that is the level of competence, they should go now, they should not wait for the election.

MR. WINDSOR:
Now we know what would happen if you guys ever did get over here. It is not likely, though.

MR. WELLS:
Now, Mr. Speaker, nobody in this Province believes that nonsense. They know what the government is trying to do, choke off debate on the budget because they do not like hearing the truth. They have a real aversion to somebody expressing an honest opinion of what they have done to the economy of this Province. That, Mr. Speaker, is exactly what this amendment is about, letting the people of this Province know exactly what the government has done to the economy of this Province. Mr. Speaker, we intend to do that. There is no intention to hold up debate in this House any longer than is necessary to make that point, and I have no doubt a few other hon. members will want to speak to the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, when the debate adjourned yesterday, I was talking about the impact the railway deal that has now been concluded will have on the economy of this Province and our financial position in the future.

Two further things necessitate some further elaboration: Part of it is the petulance and childishness of the Government House Leader. When I introduced the private member's resolution respecting the railway, Mr.

Speaker, the hon. minister then stood and introduced his own resolution, and I want to read it:

'WHEREAS the Leader of the Opposition is very repetitious and boring.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:

Immediately after I read the resolution, he stood up and this what he said: I ask all hon. members and anybody else listening to remember that this is a measure of the intelligence and competence and ability and integrity and sincerity of the Government House Leader. That is what we are testing, Mr. Speaker, and this is what this hon. gentleman stood and gave as his government's official response to a resolution that Canada continue her constitutional obligation in Newfoundland with respect to the railway. Here is the official response, Mr. Speaker. Now just listen to it so that the electorate of this Province can judge the quality and competence of the government.

'WHEREAS the Leader of the Opposition is very repetitious and boring;'

My, how intelligent and how perceptive of him.

'AND WHEREAS the Leader of the Opposition continues to misinform the people of this Province;'

They do not like what is going out, Mr. Speaker. They do not like what the people of this Province are hearing about the government. They do not like what was in the Liberal Party resolution about the railway and the government deal with respect

to the railway. There is no misinformation, it is a position only.

DR. COLLINS:

We understand the people of Newfoundland did not like it either.

MR. WELLS:

And then he went on and said:

'AND WHEREAS the leader of the Opposition continues to make statements that are injurious to the public good.'

What he really means is injurious to the political well-being of the Tories, Mr. Speaker. Then there is this resolution:

'BE IT RESOLVED that this House insist that the Leader of the Opposition tell the truth the whole truth and nothing but the truth to the truth to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a measure of the intellectual competence and ability and political integrity of the Government House Leader and the government he represents and speaks for.

It will stand, Mr. Speaker, as a monument to shame, as it ought to be, for the performance of the government. That, Mr. Speaker, is on the Order Paper, next to another equally silly resolution respecting me personally, 9 and 10 on the Order Paper. The other resolution wants it resolved to go on record as opposing any attempt to give fish to France in order to negotiate the agreement.

MR. TULK:

Why are they after you, though?

MR. WELLS:

Because they know they are going to lose the next election, that is why they are after me. Because they know their next election is lost already, they cannot deal with the Liberal Party on the merits of the issue, they have to attack the person.

MR. TULK:

You must have some special meaning for that crew.

MR. WELLS:

It certainly seems that way. It drives fear and shivers through their bones, you can be sure of that.

MR. FURFY:

We might even get a Speaker, after this.

MR. WELLS:

Now, Mr. Speaker, here is the truth the hon. the President of the Council wanted in that resolution. There is no question, Mr. Speaker, as to what the negotiators, at the time the Terms of Union were negotiated, discussed and agreed upon and intended to write and reflect in the Terms of Union: 'That assumption of the railway and steamship services would be justified on the ground that it was merely the extension of the coast to coast transportation system to take care of the needs of the new Province.' And there is no doubt about that, Mr. Speaker, that is there. That is not a lie, that is not a misstatement, that is taken out of the records, and the time and place and date are all quoted, and anybody who has sufficient objectivity to sit and look at it can and go and see it, and see what it means and see what it represents.

But a government, Mr. Speaker, that wants to sell-out the future of its Province, that wants to sell us out for a bit of political money to run an election, will do anything; they will stop at nothing in their desperation to survive, which is what they have done.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if hon. members opposite are at all honest and sincere in their concern about Newfoundland, how can they possibly oppose a resolution which would say this? 'That the Terms of Union should be amended to the extent necessary to affirm that the constitutional obligation of Canada to relieve the Province of Newfoundland of the public cost incurred in providing the Newfoundland portion of the national transportation system is a continuing one, and Canada has responsibility in perpetuity for the additional financial burden placed on Newfoundland to upgrade, operate and maintain the Trans-Canada Highway to a standard adequate to accommodate the traffic diverted to it by reason of the phasedown and closure of the railway in Newfoundland.'

Mr. Speaker, if the government wanted to, that resolution could be called now and put without debate, or with such debate as any hon. members wanted to have, and passed. Are they ashamed to ask for that from the Government of Canada? Do they oppose Newfoundland having that constitutional guarantee? Is that what they are opposed to, that protection for Newfoundland? Why would they possibly vote against it? Because it would do them out of the \$100 million political slush fund they got. That is why they are opposed to it.

No wonder, Mr. Speaker, they do not like that being stated and made known to the public, no wonder they are running scared and they put these silly, childish, juvenile resolutions on the Order Paper, no wonder they are ashamed of what they are doing.

The second part of the resolution, Mr. Speaker, is 'to request the Government and Parliament of Canada to increase and pay earlier, as maybe necessary, the funds provided for in the Memorandum of Understanding dated June 20, 1988 in order to give proper effect to Canada's constitutional obligation respecting the Newfoundland portion of the national transportation system.' How can they possibly be opposed to that? You can eliminate the recitals if you want to, Mr. Speaker, and just put those operative clauses in there and vote on them. How could they oppose it? And by sitting there silently and refusing to bring the resolution on, they are saying to the Newfoundland people we do not want this for Newfoundland. There is no other conclusion that can be drawn from it, none whatsoever. And it is unavoidable, Mr. Speaker. That conclusion is unavoidable. It is there in black and white, their refusing to call the resolution, refusing to have it put, refusing to support it, because it will show them up for the dastardly deed they have done in signing that intolerable agreement with respect to the railway.

MR. DINN:

Tell us about Churchill Falls.

MR. PEACH:

Tell us about that one.

MR. DINN:

I challenge you to talk about Churchill Falls.

MR. WELLS:

I will indeed. You give me the time and I will do it.

MR. PEACH:

Tell us what role you played in Churchill Falls.

MR. WELLS:

I will give it in detail. As soon as I have the time, he will have full details and the minister will not like it at all.

MR. WINDSOR:

No, I will not like it. (Inaudible) Churchill Falls, you can be sure of that.

MR. WELLS:

Indeed he will not like it.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. WELLS:

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is for another day and that is coming up.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You are darn right it is coming up.

MR. WELLS:

Indeed it is coming up, and the minister is not going to like what he hears.

MR. TORIN:

Tell us how much money you made on the Hibernia deal going to court.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, this is going to take a lot longer than I thought, if hon. gentlemen keep shouting like this. They do not like what they hear.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. WELLS:
Mr. Speaker, the minister does not know where he is. He thinks he is back in kindergarten, or maybe he has not left.

Mr. Speaker, the thing that concerns me most about this is the impact on the economy of this Province of that agreement.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. WELLS:
From a purely selfish point of view it is great, because the electorate of this Province is going to reject it totally, and reject the members totally because of it. Politically it is advantageous to us, but the harm to Newfoundland is immense, because they have prejudiced Newfoundland's position greatly by agreeing to it. Fortunately, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Party will come to the rescue of Newfoundland again, as it did in the case of Term 29.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:
When the Tories tried to deprive Newfoundland of its constitutional rights under Term 29, that great Prime Minister, Mr. Diefenbaker, tore apart our Terms of Union and tore up Term 29. Fortunately, when the government changed and a Liberal government was formed in Ottawa, that was redressed. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Party has agreed that when the Liberal Party forms the Government of Canada again shortly, it will agree to alter the Terms of Union to make provision for proper and fair

treatment of Newfoundland. And, Mr. Speaker, they will find a welcome Liberal government in this Province, sitting there, negotiating and working on it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:
Mr. Speaker, if perchance there is a Liberal government formed in Ottawa by this Fall, before an election is called in this Province, then we are going to insist that this government agree to amend the Terms of Union, even though they do not want to amend the Terms of Union, to have that benefit for Newfoundland.

MR. TULK:
Right on!

MR. WELLS:
We will insist that they do it, and I think the people of this Province will not allow them to refuse that benefit that the government of Canada will want to provide for Newfoundland.

MR. TULK:
How can they?

MR. WELLS:
There is an indication that they are going to do it.

MR. TOBIN:
We have some good quotes (inaudible) from the Leader of the Opposition that we will use at the right time and expose your (inaudible) lives. We have some good quotes from when you were in court.

MR. WELLS:
Yes, like the Pickersgill letter. Some good things like the Pickersgill letter. And the story of Romulus and Remus, no doubt,

will come out before too long.

MR. TORIN:

Tell us about the Royal Trust?

MR. WELLS:

I will tell you about the Royal Trust. I acted for the Royal Trust Company as the trustee for the investors, for the bondholders in the Churchill Falls thing, and I was paid for services rendered.

The impact on the economy of this Province will be immense, because we have the second longest Trans-Canada Highway in the country, second only to Ontario. We cannot now even maintain our hospital beds and our schools properly, so how are we going to take on this additional transportation burden? Notwithstanding the position taken, Mr. Speaker, by hon. members opposite, when the government changes, which will happen very shortly, we will solve this problem.

If I may summarize the position I have taken on the amendment and the reason for the amendment that I have proposed and the non-confidence motion in the government, Mr. Speaker, I have gone over all the facts and figures, and I do not need to repeat them except to summarize briefly that in the last few years this government has caused our population to come to a dead halt and then to start to decrease. For the last three years they have caused our population to decrease. They have driven 18,000 people out of this Province so that they could try and find the means of putting food on their family's table with a degree of dignity and self-respect, they have increased the number of people unemployed by 13,000, they

have increased the number of people in this Province receiving unemployment insurance by 22,000, and they have increased the number of people in this Province living below the poverty line by 32,000. That is the legacy of this administration to this Province, Mr. Speaker, and that is exactly why this side of the House has no confidence in the government and why this motion was moved. It also reflects clearly the opinion of the vast majority of the voters of this Province, and as soon as they have the courage to call the election, they will get an overwhelming vote of non-confidence directly from the voters. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

I must say, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition has stayed true to his constant position since being elected, if you want to call it elected.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Bought! Bought!

MR. SIMMS:

Well, members can use whatever term they wish. I am not going to say that, it might be considered to be unparliamentary.

However, the same tactic he has used since day one, back last may or whenever it was, just after

they did the knife job on poor old 'leo' over there, just after he became elected leader, the party's position on just about every issue, and I must compliment them on it, has been exactly the same, it has been a message of constant gloom, a message of constant doom, a message of constant negativity, and a message of constant criticism.

AN HON. MEMBER:

He cannot keep a straight face over there, because he knows what he said is a lot of nonsense.

MR. SIMMS:

- constant criticism for the sake of criticism.

I must say, after that speech he has all of us over here shivering in our shoes, there is no question about that. Mostly what his speech contained was personal attacks on me, which is a bit strange. I cannot help it if the hon. the Leader of the Opposition does not like me. I cannot help that. I cannot help it if I get his dander up. I cannot help that.

MR. DAWE:

You should be thankful he does not like you.

MR. SIMMS:

I should be thankful, that is right. But he did as he always does in his pompous, pious way, get up and preach and lecture, preach doom and gloom, criticize for the sake of criticizing, with no alternatives to offer. He preaches to members of this House about their behaviour and their actions in the House and the way they should behave and act.

MR. KELLAND:

(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:

At least I expressed my feeling -- and I will get to the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland) momentarily, in conjunction with the same thing I am talking about right now, behaviour of members of the Legislature, behaviour of members of the House. I expressed my view in the resolution that the hon. member was kind enough to read publicly again for me, and I appreciate that, because I meant what I said in that resolution. It was not in response to the lengthy resolution, the charade that he put forth a few moments before that, that lengthy resolution on the railway. It had nothing to do with that, it has to do with the Leader of the Opposition and the Liberal Party's constant position on every issue in Newfoundland and Labrador. That is why I said he should tell the truth the whole truth and nothing but the truth, and I meant it, Mr. Speaker. I meant it because he does not, and they do not. They select what they want to pass out, all the negative aspects of anything that might be around, but they never, ever mention any of the positives.

He lectures us as to how we should act in the Legislature as members of the House. I wish he would take the time to lecture some members of his own caucus.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Like who?

MR. SIMMS:

Like the member for Naskaupi, who does not have the courage of his convictions; he does not have the courage to say publicly what he tries to say in this House through passing little notes around the Legislature, nasty little comments about individuals in the

Legislature. And then that same individual from Windsor - Buchans, the Leader of the Party, has the gall to get up in this House and lecture us on the way we perform or act. Why does he not spend some time with his own members? What I am talking about, Mr. Speaker, may very well become public, because the member involved is quite upset by it and intends, I understand, to raise a point of privilege with respect to the matter.

Now, in his few brief remarks, the Leader of the Opposition asked 'Who is going to believe that we will run out of money by the end of June?' I mean, does he think we are just doing this for fun? The reason we evoked closure, and I will get to that, Mr. Speaker, is because we have a responsibility as the government to the people of this Province to ensure that that budget is passed by today. There are reasons for it, which I will outline.

Now, he cautioned his remarks today by changing what he said publicly, outside. He is quoted in the newspaper today as saying there has only been six and a half hours - I think it said six and a half hours - on the budget debate. Today what he meant was, it has only been five hours by members of the Opposition.

Well, Mr. Speaker, members on this side and the members down in the corner are entitled to speak in any debate.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:
That is an example of what I am talking about. They select what they want to put out.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, there has been nine hours and nineteen minutes of debate on the budget. We have spent six days on the budget debate out of our legislative programs, six days. We have had seventy-five hours of estimates debate, and we all know that debate on the budget includes debate on the estimates, not just the budget debate. We have had seventy-five hours on that, and we have had nine hours and nineteen minutes on the budget debate. In fact, the committees which dealt with the estimates spent more than the forty-five hours allocated to them. They spent much more than that.

My estimation is that we have had somewhere near 100 hours of debate and comments on the estimates and the budget. Now, Mr. Speaker, if that is not enough, I do not know how much time the hon. members would require. But let me just show you how much of a fallacy this argument is, Mr. Speaker. They have not had time to speak on the budget. Mr. Speaker, do you know that there are fifteen Liberals over there now, or fourteen, and ten of those members have spoken in the budget debate? Ten of them in the budget debate.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:
Yes, on the motion. Ten Liberals have spoken in the budget debate, the very debate they say they have not had enough time to talk about. Two-thirds of their entire caucus have spoken in the budget debate. We have had eighteen speakers in total. That is a reasonable amount of time to be spent on the budget debate itself when you consider there are nearly 100 hours spent dealing with the

estimates.

Now, Mr. Speaker, last week we might have been able to call the budget debate, but what happened last week in this House for two or three days? You talk about a filibuster! He says he did not filibuster. What would you call it, Mr. Speaker? They got up on a motion, or an Order of the Day dealing with some piece of legislation that had absolutely nothing to do with the railway, and they spent two nights at least, two days, debating the railway, holding up the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Why should we not?

MR. SIMMS:

How were we going to call the budget debate, Mr. Speaker? They can yell and bawl all they want, but I am going to make my points. It is pretty obvious that when the cat is away the mice will play. Because when he is here, they do not open their mouths, they zipper their mouths, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that ought to be enough, nearly 100 hours of debate on a budget of \$2.9 billion. Mr. Speaker, do you know how much time they spend debating the budget in the House of Commons, the entire budget for Canada? They spend six days debating a budget of \$125 billion. Six days! Here we have a budget of less than \$3 billion. We have spent six days in our own parliament, and we have had two-thirds of the Liberals speak in the debate, and we have had seventy-five hours in our Estimates Committees, where budget estimates and budget items are obviously debated and discussed. So, Mr. Speaker, what a weak argument the Leader of the Opposition tries to make.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that the Leader of the Opposition has not sat in this House for twenty years. I understand that. And I understand what the process was like twenty years ago: There was no debate. There was no Question Period. There was no fuss in the House. No, because there were only about two or three in the Opposition. So he comes back now, reincarnated as a political leader, and wants to change the rules. Well, Mr. Speaker, the practice in this legislature is and has been in the past, that when the estimates have been concluded, the seventy-five hours of constant debate, and when certainly two-thirds of his caucus have spoken in the debate, it is not unusual, and it certainly has happened in the past, that you put aside the budget debate itself, this motion that we are now debating, and move on to other items. Mr. Speaker, that has been the practice, that is the tradition.

Literally, we had no choice but to do what we had to do today, Mr. Speaker. Literally, we had no choice. People have to be paid, and there are a lot of other reasons.

Indeed, the member for Fogo, in raising his point of order today, clearly indicated they were not going to follow this normal practice, they were not going to allow the budget to pass, and made some silly suggestion that we should put forth an Interim Supply Bill this afternoon. My God! it takes weeks, Mr. Speaker, to consult with the departments, and it takes weeks to analyze the requests of the departments.

Mr. Speaker, maybe that is the way they will operate if they ever

form the government, God help us!
I do not believe they will sit
down on a whim and write up a bill
and say, 'we want \$300 million.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMS:
My colleagues will have an
opportunity to get involved in
this debate. I would like to
continue with my train of thought.

MR. WELLS:
I have some sympathy (inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:
You see, the Leader of the
Opposition has sympathy for me.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, they
certainly implied that.

MR. PATTERSON:
You have no sympathy for the
Liberal Party with their salary
problem, no sympathy at all. They
are begging for money and you are
fleecing them to death. You
should be giving some of your own
money to the party.

MR. SIMMS:
Thank you.

MR. TULK:
A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):
Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the
member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:
I would ask the Speaker to see
that the hon. gentleman is quiet
so that the hon. the President of
Treasury Board does not lose his
train of thought.

MR. SIMMS:

There is no point of order, Mr.
Speaker.

MR. TOBIN:
Mr. Speaker, to that point of
order.

MR. SPEAKER:
To the point of order, the hon.
the Minister of Social Services.

MR. TOBIN:
Would the hon. the member for Fogo
be quiet, as well, so that the
hon. member can speak?

MR. SPEAKER:
There is no point of order.

MR. SIMMS:
I only have a few minutes left,
and there are a couple of things I
want to get to which the Leader of
the Opposition addressed, like an
election. I hope I have a few
minutes left for that. But this
is the silly excuse they make. In
summary, Mr. Speaker, here is what
he said: 'We did not have time to
debate the budget.' Yet,
two-thirds of his caucus have
already spoken to the budget
debate. Two-thirds of them! 'We
have only spent five and a half
hours on it.' In the paper he
says, 'There have only been six
and a half hours on it.' The fact
is, there has been nine and twenty
minutes on the budget debate, Mr.
Speaker. So we have to remember
all that.

Remember that in the House of
Commons they spend six days
debating a \$125 billion budget.
Mr. Speaker, if they can do it for
all of Canada, surely heavens this
is plenty of time for us to debate
our budget. The problem is they
have indicated they will not pass
the budget. That is the
indication the member for Fogo
made in his point of order. 'We

will not pass the budget. You bring in some Interim Supply or something like that, and we might co-operate there.'

So what choice were we left with, Mr. Speaker? We have people, public servants in some government departments, who would not receive their July 6 paycheque. That is a fact. Members may not believe it, but it is a fact. Outside St. John's, those cheques are distributed by July 4, which is Monday. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to listen to my officials, who have prepared this information for me, long before I listen to individuals over there. There obviously would be difficulty with government meeting its daily operating expenses to run programs that it is supposed to run, like hospital operations and all these other things. There will be some difficulties associated with that. Newfoundland businesses could be hurt, because the government would not have the funds to pay the bills they owe. I mean, that would not help. Capital construction programs would obviously be stalled if funding is not approved.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Do we owe any money to Harry?

MR. SIMMS:

Public services, like firefighting protection, there would be difficulties with those. There are all kinds of other reasons, Mr. Speaker. Those are just a few. The point is, we have a responsibility as the government to ensure that the funds are appropriated. Interim Supply is provided, based on a three month projection by every individual department and agency. They project their expenses for a three

month period, because under normal practices and in other years, before the member for Windsor - Buchans got in the House and tried to take the House on his back, tried to change all of the rules, we were finished with the budget by the end of June, and there was not a difficulty.

Let me just touch briefly on his other spurious comments with respect to electioneering, the next election and campaigning and all of that kind of thing. I noticed when he was speaking, he was trying to build up his blood pressure, because he has received criticism from people all across the Province about his weak and mediocre approach, and they cannot stand him on television. All these kinds of things have been passed on to him, Mr. Speaker, and I know it for a fact. I know somebody who told him that, by the way. He needs to brush up on his image, because people are bored with watching him on TV, and the way he approaches it.

So he tries to build up his blood pressure, and he tries to build up his caucus. They have taken a full year now, by the way, to sort of convince themselves that maybe they might have a chance in an election. Maybe! They have him convinced of that, but it is going to take them at least another several years before they convince the electorate of this Province of that same fact. Because the reality in Newfoundland and Labrador today is the people will have a clear choice when the election comes: They can return to the policies and practices of politicians of the sixties, for which the hon. member was trained, or they can go with a party that will lead them into the nineteen nineties and beyond, into the

future. The reality is the Liberal Party of today is the very same party, with all the examples over there, with the exception of the Leader of the Opposition, and they have had seven of them now in the last eight years. It is the very same party that was defeated soundly in the 1985 election, the very same party - most of them - that was slaughtered in the 1982 election, and many of them were around in 1979, Mr. Speaker. The reality is that the people of Newfoundland and Labrador are turned off day in and day out by the Opposition, and by the Leader of the Opposition in particular. There are potential candidates the leader of the Opposition had lined up, or so he thought, in his back pocket, potential candidates he spoke to, whom he thought he had

MR. YOUNG:
Star candidates.

MR. SIMMS:
Star candidates.

who have now fallen by the wayside. He may even confirm that. I doubt it, but he might.

In our case, Mr. Speaker, we have people coming out of the woodwork. We certainly do. I can give members a few examples, if they would like. Let me give members opposite a few examples of those who had better watch their bobbars.

Let us start with the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock). Now, would you think the member for Eagle River is in any difficulty in Eagle River?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
No. No.

MR. SIMMS:

Well, Mr. Speaker, if he is not in trouble by the possibility of facing us, he is in trouble with his own crowd over there. Because there are people up there now going door to door campaigning and all this kind of stuff, with the blessing of the Leader of the Opposition, by the way.

AN HON. MEMBER:
What about St. Barbe?

MR. SIMMS:
I am getting to that now. The hon. member should not get too excited. I have them all written down here. St. Barbe: Now everybody knows what is happening in St. Barbe. There are four potential candidates now who want to run for us, who want to take on the young, the glamorous Quinton Durgens, as they call him now; they are starting to call him Quinton Durgens all around the Province. St. Barbe is in some difficulty.

Fortune-Hermitage: We have already seen the campaign posters for the Liberal candidate down in Fortune-Hermitage. We have seen the posters, and it is not from the member for Fortune - Hermitage who presently occupies the seat.

AN HON. MEMBER:
It is not?

MR. SIMMS:
No, it is an old friend of the Leader of the Opposition's, I understand, a school board superintendent down there.

MR. YOUNG:
Is he one of the star candidates?

MR. SIMMS:
He is one of the star candidates, I understand. But we have seen the posters. I daresay the member

for Fortune - Hermitage has gone down there now to try to salvage his seat, if he can possibly do it.

Now let us go to the member for Bonavista North, and regrettably I say this.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, do not say Tom. No, not Tom!

MR. SIMMS:

The member for Bonavista North might be wisely advised to take a look at some other seat. Not necessarily one close by, either, but some other seat.

MR. DOYLE:

We cannot believe that. No!

AN HON. MEMBER:

Mr. Speaker, how much time does he have left?

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, you know when you are striking chords. 'How much time does he have left?', and all this kind of stuff. We hear it all.

And the member for Waterford - Kenmount (Mr. Gullage), has only been here a short period of time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

And will be here for even a shorter period of time, Mr. Speaker. Anybody who won that seat in that last by-election with 200 votes should not laugh or grin too much. He is not going to be around too much longer, and regrettably the member for Gander (Mr. Baker).

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. BAKER:

I am running in Grand Falls next time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

If the hon. member wants to come and run in Grand Falls, Mr. Speaker, I would be prepared to tie my two feet together and two hands together and take him on for the three week period.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

And the same thing would apply to any member over there, by the way. That is how confident I am these days. That is how confident I am. All I need, Mr. Speaker, is Roger Grimes, another potential star candidate for the Leader of the Opposition, to do another little story in The Evening Telegram and talk about, "I never go out and run in Grand Falls against Len Simms." That was very good of him, I thought.

And the Leader of the Opposition goes out and he talks about the divvying up of taxes. He wants to take all the taxes in Grand Falls and give it to Windsor. That was a very popular thing for him to do in Grand Falls, I can tell you. Perhaps, I can get the hon. Leader of the Opposition, along with Roger Grimes, to come out and do some door to door for me. That would be very helpful too. Perhaps, he can do that soon, Mr. Speaker, as time goes on.

Mr. Speaker, so I have addressed all the silly little things the leader of the Opposition accused me of being silly about. He got up and did exactly the same thing. Somehow he forgets about

it. I have not got time to go into them all because I have to get back to the topic of this particular debate.

We need these monies, Mr. Speaker, for the reasons we outlined and many others. The Opposition says, 'Who is going to believe him?' I can assure the Leader of the Opposition this is not some foolish little thing we wanted to do today, some little idea we had, 'let us have a bit of fun, let us have closure, let us sit all night.' We did not do it for that reason.

We did it, Mr. Speaker, because we need the monies and the Opposition were not prepared to indicate to us they would pass the budget. If they had indicated, 'Look, do not worry about that. We will have out bit of debate on it and at four-thirty today we will pass it,' or otherwise.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. STIMMS:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I hope I have dispelled the nonsense that the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Windsor - Buchans has got on with.

Thank you very much.

MR. KELLAND:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Naskaupi.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. KELLAND:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WARREN:
A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Northern Development.

MR. WARREN:
Mr. Speaker, I want to rise on a point of order and at the same time give notice that on tomorrow I will bring forward a personal point of privilege in this House. Mr. Speaker, I want to give notice because I want to check on documents which have transpired within this Assembly within the last twenty-four hours.

MR. SPEAKER:
I give notice that the hon. the Minister of Northern Development has given notice for tomorrow on a point of privilege.

The hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

At first I would like to make a few comments with reference to the previous speaker, Mr. Speaker, because points he was making brings to mind a number of different things.

To start off with, the government could long since have had the budget question settled if they had called the debate six or seven weeks ago. This is the first reference to the budget now for the better part of two months, so in the Government House Leader's attempt to cast blame on the Opposition, that is not so. The Government House Leader calls the

orders of the day and he could have called the budget debate two months ago, just about two months ago, and any time in that period.

The other point which struck me in his comments, Mr. Speaker, was the fact he implied the Opposition were delaying or filibustering because ten of our speakers, according to him, have already spoken on the budget. Therefore, he is saying, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, that the other five members of the official Opposition, and perhaps the third party in the House, do not have the right to speak on the budget, in his opinion, and that is improper and incorrect in my opinion. I do not think he has the right to dictate that sort of strategy for anybody.

On the question of strategy I witnessed, I suppose, in the last three years, a little over three years, various forms of political strategy by various House leaders. I have seen three government House leaders in action, one whom I have known, I suppose, for better than twenty years and who has now gone to the Senate. In my opinion, he is a very respected gentleman with a fine career behind him.

Another gentleman who acted in that capacity I have known since childhood as we attended the same school for a quite a number of years actually, so from the time he was a child I have known that particular gentleman.

The third I have known for a number of years, but it now seems that he still acts the part of a child, on occasion, by the pettiness he allows himself to sink to in the frivolous and spurious resolution he introduced

as related to the Leader of the Official Opposition. I find that distressing, Mr. Speaker, because I believe members of the House of Assembly who occupy important positions should act accordingly. I am talking about in particular the President of the Council and House leaders of the various parties.

I tried to rate the three government House leaders in my opinion of their effectiveness and their acumen as political strategists and so on, and how they performed in the House, and the level which they allowed the debate to either climb to, or descend to. I will not say how the rating came out, but I will say the present Government House leader did not place either first or second, in my opinion, of the three I knew.

I think it is distressing to see what is happening in the House in that the government, the Government House Leader, and others, try to bulldoze and bamboozle other members of the House into their particular agenda, when we all have responsibilities in this House. We have the opportunity and we have the right to debate issues of concern to us and the people we represent.

The question of non-confidence in government is publicly perceived, I suppose, by what the public believe the policies and the philosophies of government are, the government of the day, what they happen to be. There are a number of striking examples, I believe, which not in the large issues perhaps, the big dollar issues, the Mega projects and so on, but in other areas that tend to cause people in this Province

to lose confidence in the present administration.

I was reading some Hansard copies from last week, Mr. Speaker, and noticed particular references I found a bit objectionable because they appeared to be done in all seriousness and in no form of humour that I could detect.

It was during remarks by the Minister Responsible for Northern Development (Mr. Warren) when he made reference to the fact that the member for Naskaupi, myself, was not in the House on a particular evening sitting. As this is improper and unparliamentary, he was called to order on three or four, or four or five occasions I believe, but continued to make the comments and withdraw, but many times made mention of that fact. It was pointed out as being unparliamentary.

I have no argument. I take that in the give and take of the House of Assembly. I have no real argument with that, but what I am talking about is the presentation or perception of what ministers appear like in the eyes of the public.

I should inform the House, Mr. Speaker, on that particular evening session I was in my district and I was attending the graduation of my daughter, which many members do when the occasion presents itself. I suppose, like any father, we would look forward to doing that. I took that opportunity and I did so.

By the way, the point here is I informed the Speaker in writing prior to my departure the intention and the reasons why I was going to be absent from the

House for a period of time. With a simple question from the Minister responsible for Northern Development (Mr. Power) to myself or from anybody else, I would have been happy to tell them. It was on file and on record with the Speaker's Office, as is my practice. But that did not prevent the minister from making any reference time and time again to the fact I was absent.

But I noticed that the minister made no particular reference to absences he has occasionally incurred. He made no reference. Now, to be fair, if you mention the absence of one member from Labrador or another member from Labrador, we should include them all. He made no reference to the fact say of a Southern vacation which may have occurred in the last couple of years while the House was in session. I certainly will make no mention of any particular individual in that sense, but if you are going to do it, you do it fairly and properly. I just make that point because it does relate to the public perception of ministers in this House and how they conduct the duties of their offices as ministers, and therefore, the level of confidence they can instill in the people of the Province.

Another incident relating to another minister which I can relate I think, again, would give some example of what people are beginning to believe and have believed for the past considerable while about the current administration. This one relates to the previous Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe), who I had asked to accompany me on Churchill Falls Road, the so-called Freedom Road between

Happy Valley-Goose Bay and Churchill Falls. The previous minister had agreed.

I later took the matter up with the incumbent minister when the Cabinet shuffle had taken place and he agreed and in fact he selected the date which he would accompany me over the Churchill Falls Road. I did not select the date. He selected the date as June 17.

Now, a few days before that was about to happen I decided I would like to have confirmation of that date in writing and I wrote the minister. I have not seen a response yet but he told me verbally just a few days before June 17 he was now unable to go over the Churchill Falls Road with me because he had a commitment in Happy Valley-Goose Bay which would prevent him from doing so. The commitment, he explained to me, was to attend as a speaker a Naskaupi PC Association fund raiser.

MR. DOYLE:

Not true! (Inaudible). The commitment was to meet with the council of Happy Valley - Goose Bay.

MR. KELLAND:

I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the minister is saying. What he told me his commitment was was to attend, because he had promised 'Garfield', and he used that word, which he was referring to the Minister responsible for Northern Development, that he would go and speak at the fund raiser because he was on the agenda.

He also met, I believe, with the Council from Happy Valley - Goose Bay. But what I am saying here,

Mr. Speaker, is what is perceived to be the reason and what the government states to be the reason is not being swallowed by the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Now, to go a little further with that, when I asked the question of the Minister in the House of Assembly as to why and how much of the money that was allocated to the Trans-Labrador Highway would be spent between Happy Valley - Goose Bay and Churchill Falls, he made the comment to me that 'too bad' or words in that respect 'too bad the member did not accompany me up over the road on Saturday, and he would have seen' and so on. Now he already refused to go up over the road with me because he had commitments on Friday and Saturday.

Now I had meetings set up with people in Churchill Falls based on the minister's promise to go up over the road with me on the 17. I asked him would he go on Saturday. He said, "No, he would still be busy." I asked him the following week, and he said, "He would not know. He would get back." He has not gotten back to me nor has he ever replied to my letter looking for written confirmation.

Now that is not something that is going to instill confidence in the government of the day in the minds of the people of the Churchill Falls and Happy Valley - Goose Bay. I suggest the minister may very well have met with the Town Council of Happy Valley - Goose Bay, but I would suggest in the opinion of an awful lot of people in Happy Valley - Goose Bay and Naskaupi district the reason why he and at least two other ministers went up at public

expense was to attend a Naskaupi PC fund raising function on the 17.

MR. DOYLE:

Not so.

MR. KELLAND:

I am not saying it is so or not. I suggested in the minds of most people up there, that is the belief.

The other thing I want to talk about relates to another department, but in general the government. Again I speak about the confidence in the government. I suppose the best example of lack of confidence in the government of recent times relates to the Sprung project. I feel an obligation to mention that because often in Question Periods we are somewhat limited to what we can say and the answers we get, obviously, which are based on what ministers wish to say.

But, anywhere you go in this Province, anywhere, the Sprung project has become the biggest single joke I have heard in about three years, and I have heard a few, and I have told a few, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FUREY:

Our national joke.

MR. KELLAND:

Yes, it is more than that. It goes beyond the Province, it is a national joke. Talk to someone outside of the Province and they will say in a mimic Newfie accent, 'How are the cucumbers doing, boy?' That is what they do to us. That group over there has made us an even a greater joke as they continue to push on with the Sprung project and state support for the Sprung project while deep in their hearts and souls and guts

they do not feel confident of that.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. KELLAND:

Yes, I pray for things like that.

And why has the Sprung project become such a joke? Well, to start of with, there is an awful lot of money that went in there on something that was not in any way guaranteed. The only guarantee came from the government and it seems to be guaranteed to fail. Beyond that, I do not know what the guarantees are worth. Something in excess of \$22 million in total has been invested in the project.

Some very strange figures have been mentioned. The Premier talks about \$1.08 a pound in order to be successful. But, down in Massachusetts wholesalers can buy them for twenty-seven or twenty-nine cents a pound. They go anywhere from \$1.59 to \$1.55 to \$1.18 to .65¢ to .79¢ in St. John's supermarkets, depending on the political pressure of the day, that is what it relates to.

Make no mistake, lost leaders be as they may, but political pressure of the day seems to dictate the price of Sprung cucumbers in St. John's and other parts of the Province.

Over a period of time in asking questions of the Premier and other ministers about the viability of their financial commitments to the Sprung project, the final stance or the most recent stance of the Premier was simply that 'Oh, well, ask the company, ask Mr. Sprung. He will give you all the information you need. I have answered all I am going to answer.'

So, taking the Premier at his word, on the 1st of June I had a telephone conversation with Philip Sprung and he was quite cordial. I told him I had a number of questions I would like to have answered and the Premier, the representative of his equal partner in Newfoundland Enviroponics, had suggested I contact him for the information. He was quite cordial. He would not give me the information verbally. His reason being that the company had adopted a policy of not responding to verbal questions, or not responding verbally because they had often been misquoted. Rather, they would rather have a written question and provide a written answer. Well, I facsimiled these nine questions, Mr. Speaker, to the Sprung operation on June 1.

The questions relate: What were the weekly sales figures for Newfoundland and Labrador in the Newfoundland and Labrador market for Sprung cucumbers? I will not read them all, Mr. Speaker. What are the total monthly costs of operations of the greenhouse? What the percentage of production of cucumbers is being rejected for packaging and sale? That kind of thing.

Based on the cordial telephone conversation and the suggestion by the Premier I direct my questions to Mr. Sprung, I anticipated an answer within a reasonable time, I would say one week or two weeks. But now we are well beyond that, we are at the end of the month, and this was sent on the first of the month and no answers have been forthcoming.

So, when you talk about the investment by the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador of some

substantial part of that \$22 million, I believe the government is sort of on the hook for something like \$15 million, it comes to my mind that that \$15 million would go a long, long ways towards the \$20 million that is required to build a new hospital in Happy Valley - Goose Bay to service the needs of various sections of Labrador, including the section represented by the member for Torngat Mountains. Or, that \$15 million would go a very long ways towards upgrading, reconstructing, and finishing the 'Freedom Road' portion of the Trans-Labrador Highway.

So these things cause us and the people to lose confidence in the administration because they are not functioning properly. I remember when the now Minister of Health was the Minister of Finance, pardon my small chuckle, Mr. Speaker, it was not really intended, but I was thinking of a particular debate in which I referred to the minister one time. It seems to me that that particular joke in the Province was that the minister had absolutely no ability to predict the financial status of the Province with any degree of accuracy.

DR. COLLINS:

Actually, it was one of the most accurate predictions in the Atlantic Provinces. Check it out, including the federal government.

MR. KELLAND:

Well, if it is one of the most accurate predictions that he has ever presented, it does not say a whole lot, I suppose, for some of the other work he carried out while he was Minister of Finance.

There are some references here,

Mr. Speaker, that might be worthwhile looking at and bearing repeating.

The minister says, 'The Province is in an increasingly difficult position. Our economy remains weak, while other provinces strengthen and prosper. Our employment picture is a national disgrace.' This is from the 1987 Budget by the Hon. John F. Collins. 'This harsh assessment,' it goes on, 'at the outset of our 39th year in Confederation is confirmed by an array of factual evidence which allows for no other interpretation,' an admission of failure of fifteen or sixteen years of Tory government.

'For the year immediately before us, we anticipate extremely trying and testing circumstances, particularly for the financial status of the government itself in its role of a deliverer of the vast bulk of public services needed by our people,' Hon. John F. Collins, now the Minister of Health. This has a ring to it because it has a ring of the admission of failure by the Tory Government to cope with the financial and other problems that beset this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. KELLAND:
That is what it is. It is nothing more; it is nothing less than an admission of failure, that fourteen or fifteen or sixteen years of Tory rule is now coming to a grinding, shuddering halt. Anything will be done now to salvage your bacon, anything, any petty point, any small subject, anything you can dredge up, personal attacks on various members on this side of the House,

whatever, you can drum up, whatever pettiness, whatever smallness, whatever narrowness of mind you can come up with is what we will see and I predict we will see that over the next period of time, until such time as the Premier reaches a level of confidence and arrogance to draw up a writ and call the election.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. KELLAND:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker, what we have here this afternoon is not only important to this House of Assembly but is important to every person in this Province because we have before us a budget debate and more important than that, the amendment to the budget debate. It reads: "That this House condemn this government for its failure to actively present the true state of the economy of the Province and consequential failure to take -

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I think the hon. member has already spoken on the budget debate.

MR. EFFORD:
No, no, Mr. Speaker, to this

amendment.

MR. SPEAKER:

To the amendment.

MR. EFFORD:

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As I was saying, 'the consequential failure to take budgetary action to deal with the real problems.' That is the question, Mr. Speaker, the real problem facing the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador today. What is the real problem? What are some of the things that make up the problem facing this Province?

We can go into many, many areas where the problems are and they all come together as one major problem. The major problem is the major financial situation in which the Province is placed. The government of this Province has to operate like any business in this world. Any business operates on an income and an expenditure, and it has to have the proper management at the head of that business to ensure that the money is spent where the priorities are right to manage the affairs of the people of this Province. There is no question about that.

If any administration would take the funds that are coming in through equalization payments, coming in through the form of taxes and whatever other means the government treasury of this Province receives their money and mismanages that money, then we

have the situation the Province faces today.

Now, in what areas is the money being mismanaged?

Let us take one example at a time. Let us talk about our health care system. What is the reason why we have a Minister of Health (Dr. Collins) and a Department of Health set up to government and to regulate all the hospitals within our Province? It is to give the people of the Province the best service possible with the amount of money available.

We know certainly, Mr. Speaker, that money does not grow on a tree and you cannot go out and get a million dollars everytime that you need it. But what you can do, Mr. Speaker, is to manage the health care system with the amount of money available. The Minister of Health is quite right when he says that the Province is spending in excess of \$600 million in the health care system of this Province and there is possibly not enough money to give the service that everybody would like because, no matter how much money you put in, there is always room for more and we have no argument with the Minister of Health and his government in that statement.

But what is happening to the health care system in this Province, and the reason why we have to debate this bill and to put this motion forward is it is not being managed in the right way to give the people the best health care system that should be available with the amount of money that is provided.

MR. J. CARTER:

What would you do?

MR. EFFORD:

What would I do, if I were in the position of managing that money, I would put my priorities for the concerns of the people in the right area and not base it on a political vote in my district or any other part of the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

That is what is happening to this government. Every decision they make in the expenditure of their money is a political decision and not on a priority decision. It is very simple.

Let us talk about the number of hospitals on the Burin Peninsula. The Burin Peninsula right now has three major hospitals and one cottage hospital. There is no way that the government of this Province can provide the funding to properly staff, equip and provide enough specialists to the people on the Burin Peninsula to keep those three hospitals going. It is absolutely financially impossible! But the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Matthews), as MHA of his district went in and told the people of St. Lawrence that under no circumstances would that hospital close. He knows full well that the money is not there to properly staff and equip that hospital.

If they would come to the decision and give the people of that Peninsula the type of health service that they deserve -

AN HON. MEMBER:

You hope!

MR. EFFORD:

No, no seriously. Give the people

the type of health service they deserve and you would operate one hospital properly staffed, properly equipped. That is what you would do if the money is not there to operate the three of them at the scale they are operating now and to properly equip them.

What would you do with the hospital that is existing now in St. Lawrence? You would give the people of St. Lawrence the nursing home facilities they need, turn the hospital into a nursing home facility that the people of the Burin Peninsula so desperately need. There is not enough beds now to provide that type of service on the Burin Peninsula and that is what should be done. But, because the government on that side figures if they close that hospital they are going to lose a few votes, they are keeping it open, not realizing that if they made the right decision and spent the money in the right way, that would give them votes in the long run and money would spent on the priority basis and the people would respect them for that.

AN HON. MEMBER:

That is not right.

MR. EFFORD:

It is absolutely right.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is another area. I do not want to prolong this and go over the same things that we have been saying all year.

Let us go into the fisheries. The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) today, questioned in the House of Assembly, tried to tell us he is not responsible for the regulation of the caplin fishery. Yet he will tell us that he, the provincial government, in

in conjunction with the federal government, drafted the rules to regulate boat building, the salmon fishery, cod fishery, mackerel fishery, herring fishery, squid fishery, and every other sort of fishery, the size of boats, the type of gear they use, the season when it opens, and the season when it closes. They are totally responsible. Yet, he tells us in the House of Assembly today he is not responsible for the regulation of the caplin fishery.

What does the caplin fishery mean to the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador? It means a \$70 million income to the Province this year. It means the creations of hundreds and hundreds, thousands of jobs around the Province and we got some encouragement. Back in January, 1988, Mr. Ray Andrews, Deputy Minister of Fisheries, introduced this paper, 'Caplin Fishery Stability in the Future, An Assessment of the Industry and Plan for Future Development and Management.' I do not think there is one person in this Province, nor any member of this House of Assembly who can condemn the intentions behind why that was done. It was done to regulate the caplin fishery in Newfoundland so we would not operate from year to year, that we would have a plan in effect to ensure we have stability in the Japanese market and we have stability in the jobs from year to year. That is the reason why money was put into this venture.

We would have thought that the Minister of Fisheries, in conjunction with his Deputy Minister of Fisheries, would have had some power in regulating how this management plan was going to be put into effect, but the Minister of Fisheries stood in

this House of Assembly today and said, 'No, it is not our fault, it is the fault of the fishermen, the fault of the unions and the plant processors.'

Now, it is absolutely ludicrous for any Minister of Fisheries to stand in this House and make that kind of a statement when his own recommendations state very clearly that a management plan must be put into effect to properly control the amount of caplin harvested in each individual bay depending on the amount of plants and processors there to purchase that amount of caplin. It should all so be governed and regulated that caplin will not be caught before it is ripe enough, that they will not have too much red feed in them so as to protect and insure that the Japanese are confident that Newfoundland is going to provide an 'A - One' product and that markets will be there in 1989, 1999, and so on. That was not done this year!

The caplin fishery, where every fishermen in this Province should have made a substantial amount of money, has been a complete, abysmal failure. Why? Because the management plan was not put in place. The Minister of Fisheries went so far with it and unfortunately, and it is an excellent move, an excellent recommendation, I have no argument with it whatsoever, the only argument is the regulations were not put in place to govern the caplin fishery in 1988.

I only hope that the Minister of Fisheries is correct in his statement that he is providing to ensure that there will be a good market for 1989, but I am scared. I am scared about the amount of caplin that were caught. I will

talk very specifically about Conception Bay. It is a very large bay with some four or five provincial districts represented in the whole of Conception Bay, but what happened in Conception Bay was that the large caplin purse seiners came into the bay, caught the caplin in the deep waters before the caplin were ripe, sold it for one and a half or two cents a pound, which has done two things. The first thing done was it took the caplin away from the inshore fishermen, the purse seiner and the fixed gear fishermen, and before they had an opportunity to catch it, the quota was caught.

What then has it done to the market? If bad caplin are put on the market, the Japanese are going to go to Norway and Iceland next year in the Winter fishery and they are going to buy the caplin. Consequently, what happens is Newfoundland next year will lose a great share of its market and so goes the jobs, so goes the profit made by the fishermen, and so goes the plant workers' jobs. That is what has happened this year.

What I am going to see, as the representative from my district out there this year, we are going to have what happened a couple of years ago: We are going to have people going on hunger strikes to try to get their stamps to provide enough food for them this Winter, when the money should have been on the caplin fishery, if it had been properly managed and properly regulated, every fisherman in this Province should have made sufficient money this year to provide them with at least enough stamps to see them through the Winter. But, because of the way in which this government administers, regulates and governs

this Province, we have seen another failure in a fishery which should have been nothing but a complete and tremendous success. Mr. Speaker, that is an example of why this Province is in the situation it is in today.

I sat in this House of Assembly a couple of days ago and listened to the Minister of Development and Tourism (Mr. Barrett) get up and give one of his attacking speeches. You would think when you hear the Minister of Development and Tourism stand up in this House you would hear him give us some encouragement about what is going to be done in the future, because he is responsible for the development of this Province as far as business and as far as tourism is concerned.

What did we listen to for twenty minutes? We listened to nothing only garbage come out of the Minister of Tourism and Development's mouth, pointing at each individual on this side of the House, run them down with personal attacks and political attacks which had nothing to do with what direction his department is going to take in the future.

We have a responsibility to the people of this Province to ensure they are going to be governed in the best possible way which is going to create jobs for the future of our young people, for the 40,000 people who are now unemployed, 17,000 of which are youth. Between the ages of sixteen and twenty-five, we have 17,000 people unemployed in this Province, with no future.

MR. TORIN:

And you want to close the Grand Bank and St. Lawrence hospitals and throw more people out of work.

MR. EFFORD:

No, what the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Tobin) said there is absolutely wrong. To provide the best health care system in this Province, close those two hospitals for medical service, put all your emphasis on one hospital and use the other two hospitals for nursing homes. We have a line up for all the nursing homes in this Province, from Carbonear to Port aux Basques with people on a waiting list who cannot get into nursing homes. We have twenty-five or thirty beds in all our hospitals taken up by senior citizens who are too sick to be kept at home but should be in a nursing home. There are not enough beds. That is what should be done with those institutions.

And you would employ people, nurses and nursing assistants, janitors, and the same people who are employed there now would be employed that way, but we would spend our dollars wisely.

There is no way the people should be out of work. People on the Burin Peninsula, as well as the people in Port aux Basques, as well as the people in Gander, have a right to work as anybody else in this Province. We have no argument with putting them to work, but spend your money in the right way so that you give them the service they deserve.

Mr. Speaker, what should be done in this Province with tourism? If this government would recognize the amount of dollars which could be brought to this Province through tourism it would be absolutely unbelievable. We know the season is short but, what would it mean to have to our students? What would it mean to the 17,000 young people if we

would start recognizing the advantages we could have in this Province in the Department of Tourism?

If the Minister of Tourism spent half the time in this Province he does travelling other countries of the world, we would be 200 per cent better off in this Province as far as the Department of Tourism is concerned than we are today. All he has to do is stay in the Province, face the facts of what is needed in this Province, and make sure that when the money is spent, it is spent in a priority area and not in a political area. It would mean a lot to the 17,000 young people and the students who are coming out of university and coming out of trade schools with no future except to leave this Province and travel to the other provinces of Canada to try to find employment.

I know we can say, "Well, some of the people want to travel." That may be true. Some of the people do want to get out, but the majority of people want to stay in their own province. That is what they want to do. Without young people, we are going to face a bad future.

If the same number of young people keep on travelling out of this Province, we are going to have a vacuum in this Province where we are going to have a generation that is going to be non-existent because they are going to have to travel out of the Province to Ontario, Vancouver, Edmonton, Nova Scotia wherever they have to go to seek employment to try to survive.

Mr. Speaker, there are areas and areas we can keep on talking about and see where this government has mismanaged them. The most recent

one is where the President of Treasury Board stood up here today and talked about how we filibustered for two days last week on the railway.

I say, Mr. Speaker, we should have kept it going for another two months because of the way in which we were sold out by this government on the railway. There is nobody on this side of the House ever stood in this House and said we should keep the railway forever and ever. We know the railway is not providing the transportation needs we need in this Province, but before we gave away the railway, we should have ensured that we had at least a decent mode of transportation in this Province that would have provided for all people of this Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

What we got in this deal was nothing above what we were already getting - a complete sell-out. In fact, I would suspect, Mr. Speaker, I have not seen the figures yet, but I hope to in the near future, by the time the railway gets rid of all the engines, the cars and all the equipment they have in this Province, by the time they get all the amount of dollars they have from the sale of that equipment, it will be more, Mr. Speaker, it will be much, much more than we got to build a highway across this Province, the \$400 million. I suspect, Mr. Speaker, the railway will come out of that, just by the sale of the equipment alone, with a profit. It is absolutely unbelievable!

Mr. Speaker, does the railway matter to the people of this Province? It does not matter a great deal that the railway should

have stayed here, but it matters that we have a decent mode of transportation. We started back several years twinning the highway from St. John's to Whitbourne. That was planned very carefully several years ago. We have already been out to Butterpot Park and here we see a government bring in a railway deal last week so we are going to get the highway twinned from St. John's to Whitbourne. That was already signed, sealed and delivered! How was that an addition to the railway deal?

MR. J. CARTER:

Planned, but where was the money?

MR. EFFORD:

On the money, we are out now to Butterpot Park. That is nothing new. That was there. How can that be added into the transportation deal? This is how ludicrous it is. We are going to twin the highway from St. John's to Whitbourne. I agree with it going from St. John's to Whitbourne, but it should go much, much further. What is happening to the traffic after the highway stops at Whitbourne? Are you telling me the trucks are going to go to Whitbourne and that is where they are going to stop? They all those extra transport trucks are going to stop beyond that? So there is no freight, there is no traffic, now listen to this, Mr. Speaker, there is no freight going beyond Whitbourne, no traffic going beyond Whitbourne. Can you just imagine? I am going to go out to Bellevue next week and I am going to tell the people of Bellevue, once the highway is twinned from St. John's to Whitbourne, that is where traffic ends. No more highways, Mr. Speaker, we do not need a highway past that. We close out that road

altogether. This is how foolish this administration talks. We close out that highway altogether and we go over to Corner Brook and we take up the highway, in between, there is no need for a highway, absolutely no need, Mr. Speaker.

How ludicrous! How foolish can anybody talk? Here we are and we cannot provide enough money for hospitals; We cannot provide enough money for education; We cannot provide enough money to keep the plant workers and the fishermen working at a decent wage, but we can provide enough money to maintain the highway. Now, where is the money going to come from to maintain the highway? We cannot maintain the highway we have there now.

MR. CALLAN:
ERDA.

MR. EFFORD:
ERDA! The hon. the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) should think about what he said over here just a few short months ago when he spoke about how we cannot maintain roads and he was trying to get the money for his district in Bellevue.

Mr. Speaker, if the money could be provided for the maintenance of the highway, why can we not provide now money for a decent health care system in this Province, for a decent education, and to maintain the highways that we have now?

Mr. Speaker, it is very clear. We have several districts out in Conception Bay and not one dollar is provided in that transportation deal to provide a decent highway out in Conception Bay. Two years ago we had 5,000 cars per day

going over the Bay Roberts Highway. The latest statistics will show very clearly it is increased now from 5,000 cars per day to 7,000 cars per day and not one dollar is provided in that transportation deal to provide a decent highway for the traffic that goes over that highway. How can we say the government of this Province is properly administrating, Mr. Speaker, the funds and the taxpayers money that is being paid in millions of dollars by the people of this Province?

Mr. Speaker, I want to go on record very clearly, in conclusion, as condemning this government for its failure to actually represent the true state of the economy of the Province and the government's consequential failure to take appropriate budgetary action to deal with the real problems.

That is exactly what we have seen in the Department of Fisheries, the Department of Health, the Department of Education, the Department of Transportation and all other departments in this government. A total mismanagement! Money is being spent on political basis, not on a priority basis, Mr. Speaker. Until the government changes its attitude, this Opposition party on this side is going to continue to let the people know what is happening, let the people be aware. It is our job to do it, Mr. Speaker, and we are going to continue to do it.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

Before recognizing the hon. the member for St. John's North, we have three questions for the late Show. The first question from the hon. the member for Burgeo Bay d'Espoir to the hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs. The second one from the hon. member for St. John's East to the hon. Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs. The third one is from the hon. the member for Port de Grave to the hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

The hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I feel impelled to rise and reply to that hysterical outburst we have just heard from the member for Bay de Verde.

The Opposition seems to want to debate the railway more than any other aspect of the economy. I am certainly more than happy to fall in line with their wishes and to discuss chiefly the railway in any speaking slot that I get. I guess that since we are speaking on the budget all things are relevant, provided they are on this earth, and so I will speak largely on the railway.

I would be prepared to argue if we had to pay out \$800 million to get rid of the railway rather than get \$800 million for giving up the railway, it would be money well spent.

I may not get the attention of members opposite because of their good manners but I should get it from their curiosity, because that does strike one, at first glance, as being a very curious position indeed. But, I happen to be in an interesting position on the railway.

A neighbour of ours was the son of Sir William Whiteway pictured here, who was one time Speaker, but more importantly was one time Prime Minister of this country, and his son Max Whiteway was a neighbour of ours. At the time I knew him, he was quite an old man. He was retired, inclined to chat and loved to talk about his experience on the building of the railway. The reason he was so active on the building of the railway was that, although he was a past lawyer, he articulated with his father, he discovered when he was a young man that he had TB, consumption, and at that time, that was tantamount to a sentence of death. The doctors that examined him advised him to pursue an open air career. That was the only thing they could suggest that would save his life or would prolong his life. He did that. He forsook the law and he started farming and also working on the railway. He lived to be 75 nearly 80 years old. It was the cure that he took and it seemed to work. So he lived a very active life and he was deeply involved in the construction of the railway.

I was only a young man at the time, but some of the questions that he answered were not some of the questions I ask because I did not know enough to ask perhaps the right questions, but certainly the answers he gave or the stories he told gave me a very, very privileged look at the early days of the railway.

The thing which stands out in my mind most of all is the inordinate number of fires that the railway started. Carbonear, for instances, is so called because it is a corruption of, I think, Charbonneau, which means charcoal pile. The way the charcoal was

made years ago was large logs of wood would be thrown into a pit, the thing would be set fire and they would cover it over with earth, and it would smolder and smolder for days and eventually when the fire would go out, they would dig it out and they would have almost pure charcoal. This was used for making gun powder and for making certain other preparations. I am not sure what all the uses of charcoal are or were at that time, but it was greatly in demand, and that is why Carbonear is called Carbonear. But, of course, they had immense stands of wood around there. Now any one knows that it is very, very hard to get much wood in the vicinity of Carbonear.

My grandfather's family came from New Perlican. They were ship builders and that is where they cut the wood for their ships, around New Perlican, and I think it would be very hard to cut enough wood to make a respectable fence in the area of Heart's Content and New Perlican today.

These areas, the whole of Conception Bay, all up to Grates Cove, was burnt out by the branch railway line. The railways were not the only causes of the fires, but certainly they were the principle cause of the fires.

The reason the fires were so destructive was that a train would go by and perhaps start a fire, because it threw out its hot ashes, and then there would not be another train by for perhaps another day. In the meantime, any fire that started could get well underway.

I remember driving out by Birchy Lake some years ago and a fire had started by the side of the road,

but it was being attended to and it was handled. When I drove back the next day, there was only a small scar where the fire had been. It was started, it was seen, it was attended to, it was put out, and that was that.

So, not only did the railway start a great many fires but the fires they started were unnoticed until they were well out of control and the amount of damage that they did was incalculable. I think you could argue that if you had an island the same shape as Newfoundland, the same size, and more or less the same place, well wooded, you would have something well in excess of several billion dollars more, if you look at the wood and the tourist potential and the climatic protection that it gives, all the benefits that heavy woods would give you, the value has to be in the billions of dollars.

I do not think we are getting rid of the railway any too soon because, quite apart from the damage it did, I think the railway was doomed to failure in 1880 when they decided to make it a three foot six guage. I have no less an authority than an article in **The Newfoundland Quarterly** which suggests that the cost of transporting a ton of goods per mile on the Newfoundland Railway is seven times as expensive as transporting it on an ordinary, standard guage railway. Now, you would wonder: How that is possible? Well, the reason for that is that you cannot put a heavy enough engine on a narrow guage railway to tow enough cars. The trains upalong can be in excess of a mile long and, of course, the individual cars themselves are much larger. They are not that much larger but they

are quite a bit larger. But the engines are much heavier and can tow a tremendous number of cars. Of course the rail line is not as twisty as ours is and they do not have such sharp curves, but they can put much larger trains on their tracks.

Now, getting back to Mr Whiteway again. One of the things I use to ask him was, why did they build a railway at that time? He said, 'They were looking at the various countries that had railways. Britain had a railway. Britain was prosperous. The United States had a railway and the United States was prosperous. Certain other countries had railways and they were prosperous, therefore build a railway and you become prosperous.' It was as simple as that. It was that short-circuited, backward argument which convinced most of the people at the time that we should have a railway; that a railway, by itself, would bring prosperity. Of course it was the exact opposite because the railway is the very thing that sank us. If that is not a mixed metaphor, the railway can sink you.

So, the railway is going and I am glad it is going. I am sorry in one sense because it has meant a lot to a lot of people, but it has crippled and destroyed our economy. It was responsible for the loss of Responsible Government in 1934 because it was a continuous bleeding ulcer. It destroyed our forests.

If the same amount of effort had been put into, no pun intended, if the same amount of effort had been put into a mercantile marine operation, with ports and facilities, wharves and small vessels, then I think our

prosperity would have been ensured. As evidence for that statement, look at the old houses built around the turn of the century in Grand Bank, Fortune, and certain other communities around the Province. These were homes built by captains, built by owners of vessels, and by any yardstick, they are expensive, elaborate homes. They cost a fair bit to build.

Mr. Speaker, I will adjourn the debate for the Late Show.

Debate on the Adjournment [Late Show]

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

It is 4:30 and I call on the hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

The hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. GILBERT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The reason for my being on the Late Show this evening is I had some questions for the Premier on Tuesday, but the Premier was not here, so I asked the questions to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Dawe). They came from a document that the Premier published in September 1984. It is called, "The Discussion Paper on Major Bilateral Issues, Canada - Newfoundland." It was in those happy days when the two Brians were going to inflict prosperity on Newfoundland. In it he discovered the various agreements that were outstanding and he talked about the transportation

system and he covered it and he made some statements.

But, of course, since that time we heard the Premier say anything he said concerning the railway was political posturing and just to make a point, but he really did not believe it.

MR. TULK:
Who is this?

MR. GILBERT:
That was the Premier when he changed his mind on the railway, you see. So in this document he published, I believe a Goebbels inspired document he published in September, 1984, I would just like to refer to some of the points because the minister skated when I asked him the questions. He certainly did not answer them and he talked around them. I am really not expecting the answers today, but I want to make sure they are on the record and they are there for people to see.

So the first statement we heard the Premier make in his Goebbels document, "Major Bilateral Issues," was 'The Federal Minister of Transportation has constitutional responsibility for marine transportation, the Newfoundland Railway, and airport infrastructure. These facilities require a significant expenditure in maintenance and ordinary improvement.' That was one.

Right after that he says, "The Province cannot from its own financial resources maintain and reconstruct the most important transportation link in the Province, the highways network." Then he says, "The highway system in Newfoundland was the worse in Canada and required a special program of reconstruction and

operating."

Now, he is saying in 1984 that there is a constitutional guarantee to provide transportation in Newfoundland. The Premier is then saying the Province does not have the financial resources to maintain and reconstruct this transportation system. Maintain is the important word I say here because we were not able to maintain the one that is here. The next statistic he used comes from the TRIP Canada, and the information there was put in by both the government and the Construction Association which published this report. The last one came out in 1986. It agreed with what the Premier said, that our highways were the worse of any in Canada. In fact, the one in 1986 said our highways were 83 per cent defective when compared to the highways in the rest of Canada.

The last thing the Premier said was, "All forms of transportation should be addressed, air, water, road and rail. While priorities were spending maybe identified, a trade off approach would not be in the interest of this Province."

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, the trade off has been done. It now suits the Premier's political ends to say that what he said was wrong in 1984 is now right today in 1988. In other words, it is all right to trade off a rail system today for a highway system.

As we in the Opposition have said, there is no doubt about it, the railway system was not effective and was not efficient and it should be closed. I agree with the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter), yes, it should be closed, but not right now; not

until the highway is brought up to the standard that it is going to be able to take the additional freight that is going to be put on it. We should not have to sell a railway to get a highways agreement. The highways agreement should have been there. As Canadians we should have been entitled to that, and for that reason I say, Mr. Speaker, we should have had this agreement anyhow.

My feeling is the federal government, by giving this great deal that members opposite are talking about, CN and the federal government are going to get off the hook to the tune of about \$80 million a year subsidy that was going into an inefficient and ineffective system, the Newfoundland Railway. In other words, it is a great deal for the federal government but it is a bad deal for Newfoundland.

I ask the minister to justify the Premier's statements.

MR. DAWE:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. DAWE:
Mr. Speaker, in some of the comments the hon. member has asked and answered his own question as it relates to maintenance. It has been said many times before and the answers have been given many times before. I think the proper way to answer it is to refer the hon. gentleman to Hansard so he can read some of the answers.

MR. SPEAKER:
I now call on the hon. the member for St. John's East.

MR. LONG:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I want to follow up a question I put today to the Minister responsible for Intergovernmental Affairs and I do hope the minister might have a little more to say on this question than he did on the previous question, but I appreciate that perhaps the Premier is the best person to act as a spokesperson for the government on this issue. I guess it is not the case that this government has not in the past taken the opportunity to express its concern on behalf of the citizens of this Province with respect to the issue of apartheid and our relations as Canadians with the government of South Africa.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. LONG:
Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate some order so that I could be heard on this important issue.

MR. YOUNG:
I hear a mouse down in the corner, Mr. Speaker, or something is squeaking down there.

MR. LONG:
Mr. Speaker, an injury to one is an injury to all. That is a common refrain heard from people around the world, members of the international community, governments, churches and others, certainly people inside South Africa who say that until the people who are inside the prisons of South Africa, the children who are detained, the political prisoners, and until the entire people of South Africa are free, no one really in this world can be free.

This year, 1988, marks the fortieth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and it is fortunate at this time that there will be international occasions to commemorate the signing of this document, of which Canada is a signatory to and which all the provinces of Canada are obliged to uphold.

In respect of the recognition of the vital importance of governments throughout the world respecting human rights, it is critical the international community continue to do everything in its power to call upon the government of South Africa to move to dismantle apartheid and to free the prisoners of South Africa.

Next month, on 18 July, Nelson Mandella will turn seventy and it will mark twenty-five years he will have been in detention inside the jails of South Africa. It is in this context, Mr. Speaker, that I think the municipal government, the City Council of St. John's, just yesterday took what some might see as a courageous step in perhaps stepping beyond its own jurisdiction on municipal matters and deciding to take a clear and unequivocal position as a municipal government on the issue of apartheid and, in particular, the whole question of relations with the government of South Africa and any representatives of the government of South Africa.

I referred to the action taken by the City Council earlier in Question Period today and I might also remind the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Dawe) this issue is one I have followed for a number of years. Just about two years ago, when I

was employed as an educational officer with OXFAM here in St. John's, I had meetings with the Minister of Justice at the time, and the Premier, on this issue and the Government of Newfoundland joined with many other governments of provinces across the country and -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. LONG:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

- and at that time brought in a ban on the sale of all wines, brandies, and liquors through the Newfoundland Liquor Corporation, any products that came from South Africa.

I think it is appropriate today in this context to ask the government to renew its commitment to speak for the citizens of this Province on this issue by addressing it. I was quite surprised to find out just today that there is a posting down at the Newfoundland Hotel in which the consul, as a representative of the South African Embassy from Ottawa, will be meeting with a group of individuals in the City this evening. I received calls about this this morning and obviously the churches in this City and even members of the City Council would be quite concerned that our government not be seen in any way to give support to the actions of the South African Embassy.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Sit down!

MR. LONG:

Some members may have seen a full

length documentary which was aired Monday evening this week on **The Journal** which was quite a definitive piece of investigative journalism examining the role played by the South African Embassy in this country. The efforts at disinformation and manipulation of the media and the kinds of subversive activities, in fact, that the government of South Africa has engaged in this country through the offices of the Embassy of South African is something that should remind us all of the need to be vigilant.

So, very simply, Mr. Speaker, what I was asking the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs today was to make a clear statement that any representatives from the Embassy in Ottawa from the government of South Africa, would not be welcome in this Province by the government of this Province and that further, the government, as an indication of its own commitment to join with the international community, might in fact consider taking similar action as the City Council of St. John's, and that might include sending a letter to the government of South Africa calling for the immediate release of Nelson Mandella in advance of his seventh birthday next year.

There are also other measures that his government might consider taking on behalf of the people of this Province and I would encourage the minister to make some kind of indication to the people that it takes this issue seriously and would be willing to consider taking action similar to the City of St. John's.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker, obviously the member for St. John's East has taken the opportunity again to explain his case, and very well, I might add. His interest in this, as he has indicated, goes back for some time.

He is quite right in saying that the Province a couple of years ago initiated action which removed South African wines and they have not been re-ordered. We have done that, and anything obviously that we do as a Province in the context of what has become a very significant international awareness campaign would be symbolic. I think it is in that context we have to pursue some of the suggestions that have been made.

I would just like, on behalf of the people on this side of the House, to indicate we will certainly take under advisement suggestions made today, plus any other things we may wish to do to again re-emphasize the concern we have as a democratic and free Province and free Nation to try and influence people in South Africa to do away with, what I would think, no one would disagree is a very awkward and politically damaging situation of apartheid.

We will take it under advisement and get back to the hon. member.

MR. SIMMS:

Good answer.

MR. SPEAKER:

I call on the hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. FFFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I will try to make this a brief as possible. The reason why I put this question on the order paper this afternoon for the Late Show is my concern that I do not know if the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) clearly understood my question. We got a little bit sidetracked on a couple of issues. I want to point out to the Minister of Fisheries, when he gets the opportunity to answer, the reason why I put this question on the Late Show this afternoon is to clarify and to try to point out very clearly what has taken place so far this year with the fishery in Conception Bay and why, I believe, it happened. I used the reference in the caplin study that was done by his Deputy Minister which, I agree, was long overdue and excellent recommendations could come out of it, if they were properly put into place.

What has taken place, so far this year, in Conception Bay is, number one: There are two sectors of caplin fishing out there. There is the purse seining and the fixed gear. If it had been properly managed, there was no reason why the amount of quota that was set aside for that particular division that both sectors of the caplin fishery could have made a decent amount of money from the caplin fishery this year. It should have happened.

But what happened, because there are a number of plants from Bay de Verde over to the other end of Conception Bay, that all the boats from around Newfoundland, all the large purse seiners came to Conception Bay. I think it was something like 125 purse seiners came to Conception Bay.

A lot of them out there were able to go out early to the deep water and purse seine the caplin before they had an opportunity to get in deep in Conception Bay. What they did was purse seine the caplin, caught them up, and the majority of the caplin they caught had a high red feed count, which means they got a low price for it. But, considering the size of the boat, they can carry 100,000 pounds to 150,000 pounds of caplin at a time, they did fairly well with the three or four cents a pound they got for it.

But what did it do to the inshore fisherman? By the time that the caplin got inshore where the smaller purse seiner could catch the fish, the quota was caught. Now, what has this meant? Number one: It will probably hurt the market for next year. If there is bad caplin put on the market, the Japanese are not going to be happy with the caplin that is going to be sold over there next year with the red feed. Equally as serious, or more serious than that, what has it done to the small boat fisherman within Conception Bay?

All around Conception Bay those people who should have made enough money to survive this year on the caplin fishery, because the quota was pretty well before it had a chance to get inshore, these fisherman never got an opportunity to catch the caplin.

Now, what could have been done?

If the regulations had been enforced by the Department of Fisheries and not allowed the caplin fishery to open until the caplin were ripe enough so the fishermen could earn a decent wage, get a decent percentage for their catch, then they would have

been into Conception Bay and all of the boats would have an equal opportunity to catch them. But that was not done.

That is the reason why I put that question to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) today. What can be done now that the quota is caught? Obviously, it is too late now to do anything about it except, as the minister pointed out, there may be some other forms of markets we can avail of, and hopefully so.

What I would ask the minister to do, when and if those markets are available, he look at the type and number of fishermen who did not make any money this year because of the way in which the caplin season was managed. Look at it from the point of view of the number of fishermen who can avail of any markets that could be there in the future, whether it be for pet food or whether it be for the Taiwan markets or whatever markets. That is the way to do it.

It is too late in the year to control it. A market of 32,000 metric tonnes is caught now and the only thing we can look forward to is some sort of a smaller market like that. We know the price is going to be low but we can help these fishermen to at least supplement their income which they have lost through poor management.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I want to respond to a number of the items raised by the hon. gentleman in his remarks.

There is no doubt about it, there are problems in terms of putting in place a regulatory regime which responds in an adequate way to the concerns of all the players in a particular part of the fishery. But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, because of the recommendations contained in the Andrew's Report the hon. gentleman referred to, a tremendous amount of progress was made in 1988.

That is not to suggest that everything has been fixed; That is not to suggest that further progress cannot and does not need to be made. What it does suggest, Mr. Speaker, is that a tremendous amount of progress has been made and a lot of new regulations never in place before have been put in place; that even though the industry or some parts of the industry did not like them; that even though some parts of the industry did not want any regulations at all, there was, generally speaking, a consensus that there had to be a regulatory regime designed to protect the one solid market we have at this particular time, Japan. That was done, Mr. Speaker.

The one area where there was not enough consensus to move was in the definition of red feed. Mr. Speaker, you cannot unilaterally try to shove down somebody's throat some kind of a regulation they are not prepared to live with that you physically cannot enforce. You cannot be on every boat to make sure fishermen do not harvest caplin beyond a certain level of red feed. You cannot be in every plant every minutes of

the day to make sure that processors do not purchase caplin above a certain percentage of red feed. So there has to be some commonality, Mr. Speaker, there has to be some consensus.

In other words, you can only make this kind of regulatory regime work if you have on the ground with you, to help you enforce it, the representatives of the industry themselves. There has to be a representative of the two processing associations, FANL and the Caplin Exporters Association; there has to be an agreement with a representative of the fishermen, then in every single plant and community around the Province you have people who, with the Japanese technician, can do a sample and say, "No, that is above 15 per cent red feed, therefore there is going to be no fishing while it is above 15 per cent, or 20" or whatever the case might be.

But, it is totally impossible, unless there is a commitment and a consensus. We can go in and we can push thermometers down in the core centres of frozen caplin and it will come out at 18 degree celsius and if it comes out less than that, you make them shove it back in the freezer again. That is physically possible to do, but it is not physically possible to have somebody on the deck of every longliner, or in every single plant saying this caplin is okay.

I was horrified back a couple of weeks ago to find that in a certain community in Conception Bay fishermen were fishing and processors were buying 75 per cent red feed caplin. It was terrible, Mr. Speaker! I immediately picked up the phone and called FANL and called the caplin exporters and called the union. I said, "There

is one way to solve this. We should agree on a number. I do not know what it might be, 15 per cent or 20 per cent, whatever is reasonable, we agree on a number and you agree, Mr. Cashin, not to let your fishermen fish when it is above 15, you agree, Mr. FANL, not to let your processors buy when it is above 15, and you agree, Mr. Caplin Exporters, not to allow your processors to buy when it is above 15, and I will cancel the licence of anybody who does." Nobody, Mr. Speaker, would go for that.

I offered to penalize, through the licencing system of this Province, anybody who would not follow that! But I have to have somebody to help me, Mr. Speaker, I have to have the industry itself to be able to say to me, "Yes, Minister of Fisheries, we will inform you that a certain fisherman and a certain plant is buying and selling when it is above an agreed upon number." The problem is there is no agreed upon number.

That is the problem, Mr. Speaker, but I tell you: We tried to put in place the possible this year. We made a lot of progress on the possible, but the areas where we could not make progress, and there were a couple of them, that is not the only one that is in the Andrew's Report, it is probably the most obvious one right now, but there were a couple of them where we could not get the consensus that we wanted, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman knows why, he knows absolutely why. If somebody sneaks in with a load of caplin to a processor and it is bought, then everybody is going to be at it. So it is impossible to enforce it unless

the union will say, 'We will control our people,' the processors will say, 'We will control our people,' and the Minister of Fisheries can say, 'I will enforce it because I will lift the licence.'

Unless there is that kind of an approach, Mr. Speaker, it cannot be done. But, Mr. Speaker, if it cannot be done by consensus and if it cannot be done through people mutually wanting to help each other, then the government will make the definition and the government will enforce it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:
We gave them their chance.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

It is deemed that a motion to adjourn has been made and seconded. I am going to put the motion now and if the motion is carried, we will adjourn until Monday, and if it is defeated, we will return at seven o'clock.

All those in favour of the motion?

MR. TULK:
The House will adjourn until Monday?

MR. SIMMS:
It is the normal motion that is before the House every Thursday.

MR. TULK:
We will come back at seven this evening.

MR. SIMMS:
Yes, because we are going to defeat the motion.

MR. SPEAKER:
All those in favour of the motion please say "aye".

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Aye.

MR. SPEAKER:
All those against the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Nay!

MR. SPEAKER:
The motion is defeated. We will return at seven o'clock.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. SIMMS:
Can we just confirm that and maybe get the members opposite understanding because the Standing Orders clearly say eight until two, but obviously we have adjusted our hours and everybody understands it would be seven until one. Is that agreed and understood?

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:
As far as we are concerned, we had a night sitting last week and we came back at 7:00, the Speaker left the Chair, so I would imagine it is the same.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
We will return at seven o'clock.

The House resumed sitting at 7:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

The debate was adjourned by the hon. the member for St. John's North. He has nine minutes left.

The hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. J. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, when I adjourned the debate I was talking about the railway and I was talking more particularly about the son of Sir William Whiteway, Max Whiteway. This is the same man, hon. members will recall, who's duelling pistols were stolen from him by the former Premier Smallwood.

AN HON. MEMBER:
What?

MR. J. CARTER:
The duelling pistols, remember that? Until the Leader of the Opposition publicly disavows such criminal activities by his former Leader, we can have no credibility in him, none whatsoever.

MR. WELLS:
A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:
A point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. WELLS:
Mr. Speaker, it really is an incredible abuse of the rules and privileges of this House for an hon. member to stand and make the

kind of scurrilous remarks that the hon. member just did, in a similar tone as the scurrilous remarks he made about chiropractors a while ago. That is a gross abuse of privileges. All hon. members ought to disassociate themselves as early as possible with his terrible remarks.

MR. J. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
To that point of order, the hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER:
It is not necessary for me even to bring it up because it is a matter of public record. In fact, there are photographs of those pistols being presented to the former minister of, well, he is the present President of the Council, but there was a photograph of those pistols being presented to the House. He borrowed them and did not bother to return them. The Leader of the Opposition can cut it whatever way he likes, borrowing and not returning in my book is stealing.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

There is no point of order.

The hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER:
Well, as I was saying until the Leader of the Opposition publicly devowed these kinds of things, we have to assume he approves of them, and is cut from the same cloth. This is the kind of thing which destroys his credibility.

The railway was a political

football from start to finish. It started with the partial completing of the Trans-Island railway and that was no sooner finished, but the branch lines to Placentia, to Southern Shore, to Harbour Grace, to Carbonear, and to Heart's Content. I think that is all the branch lines.

The branch line that was done from Grand Falls to Botwood was done by the AND Company. Now it happened they followed the same gauge but it was not really what you would call a branch line, nor was that a political football. That was done for commercial and sensible reasons, but there could never have been any justification of the branch lines, whatever justifications there might or might not have been for the main line. My argument is that there was never really any logical or rational justification for the main line, and that I think that our Premier, our government, and our administration, deserves a tremendous pat on the back to be able to get anything at all out of any government, federal, provincial or foreign for the railway. As for the railway stock being worth anything, I can not think, it will only fetch junk prices. Maybe some bankrupt South American country will buy it because they have the same gauge, I think, but those are the only people. What kind of paper will they use to pay for it? So the assets of the railway are worth nothing. Just to ask the question is enough to answer it.

So I think we did extremely well, and I would like to praise our government for getting what they did. Of course, we would have liked more. I agree with the member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford), we would love to have

more. I mean, I am fully in agreement and I would love to ask for more. I think it is too late to ask for more because I do not think we would have gotten any more. We are extremely lucky to have gotten what we have gotten. I think it would be illogical and irrational and senseless to ask for any more.

The former member for Stephenville, Mr. Stagg, suggested an air ferry. Not such a bad suggestion and it certainly makes sense if you consider the cost of the train and the Gulf ferry. His idea was to get a very large hercules aircraft and take cars from Stephenville to Sydney. It is not such a foolish idea. It is worth looking at but, of course, I do not suppose it will be looked at now.

So I think members opposite are in agreement that the railway had to go. The only disagreement was the amount we got. I think we did extremely well.

I am sad to see the railway go in one sense. It is extremely evocative, it is part of our literature, it is part of our heritage, but it was an expense part of our heritage. I do not think we could have afforded it, I am sure we could not and I do not think we can afford it now. Besides, it is not being used.

I will take my seat now, and if any other members want to join in this debate I will try and listen.

MR. BAKER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker,

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER:

I am very happy to speak in this debate. I know, Mr. Speaker, we are speaking on the amendment to the budget debate proposed by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Wells). But I might say before I begin my remarks it is not often one gets to speak in what is really in effect a closure debate.

The Government House Leader mismanaged the business of the House and put it off to so late calling the Budget Speech and now he decides that he has to have it in a hurry. He is running into certain deadlines that are in effect artificial deadlines, Mr. Speaker, but he is running into deadlines and he now has to have the budget passed and he has invoked the rule of closure.

It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, the closure rule was invoked not on the Budget Speech itself, but on the non-confidence motion. It seems strange that as soon as the non-confidence motion is put, the Government House Leader immediately invokes closure. I suspect, in addition to the fact he needs money, what he really does not want discussed is this motion of non-confidence. I think it is rather strange that is the point at which he brought in his closure motion.

Mr. Speaker, I want to speak about the non-confidence motion. In the Throne Speech debate at the beginning of this session, Mr. Speaker, I dealt with the matter of confidence. I indicated, looking at the Throne Speech, I

did, in fact, lack confidence in this government. There are a number of reasons, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to very briefly run down through them.

In the mid-1600s, maybe in the 1650s, Thomas Hobbs said 'The reputation of power is power.' That was so true in those days because where there was a reputation to be feared, people feared. Whether they saw evidence of the power or not, they still feared and the reputation of power was, in fact, power.

More recently, over 300 years later, another rather astute observer of the political scene in this country said, 'Perception is reality.' In reality this is a rephrasing of that 1650's statement by Thomas Hobbs, 'Perception is reality.'

Mr. Speaker, you might say what does this have to do with the non-confidence motion posed by the Leader of the Opposition? Mr. Speaker, I feel they have been operating on the premise that 'the reputation of power is power, that perception is reality.' I would like to use as an example the Newfoundland Railway and that particular deal so recently signed.

We have all read the documents which have been distributed connected with the railroad deal, Mr. Speaker. It has been announced the government intends to spend \$55,000, a total of \$160,000, \$170,000, \$180,000 or something, going to be spent on propaganda to convince the people of this Province that this is a good deal.

That expenditure of money says a few things to me. Number one, it

says, the members opposite do not have any confidence in the intelligence of the people of this Province, because I would say to them right now, if they have any confidence in the intelligence of the people of this Province, then distribute this Memorandum of Understanding, sent it out as a householder, just distribute the Memorandum of Understanding. That is all they need do. The people of this Province can read. They can read this and understand what it says. There is no need to spend it in glossy advertising, TV ads, or whatever they intend to spend it on, to try to convince them it is a good deal. Show them the deal and they will make up their own minds. The advertising amount and the fact they are not distributing this Memorandum of Understanding indicates that they feel the people of this Province do not have the intelligence to deal with it.

Mr. Speaker, the perception is reality. They are operating on that principle because what they are trying to do is create a certain perception. They have been trying this since before this agreement was signed. They have been using that concept, perception is reality. They have been trying to create a perception out there.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the reality is contained in the Memorandum of Understanding. That represents the reality. The perception is represented by the ads that they are paying good money for to try to convince the people it is a good deal. That is the perception. The reality tells me a number of important things.

It does tell me that there is an expenditure of money. It does

tell me an agreement has been reached and signed by both governments. All these things are there and member opposite would not have to reiterate that. But it also tells some other important factors that people in this Province can read in this agreement and understand.

Number one, the railway is supposed to close down before any Trans-Canada Highway work is done under this agreement. Number two, the reality is that there is money in there for road construction but it is also true, Mr. Speaker, that the amount of money for road construction is less than the amount of money we have been getting all along without the railway going. That amount of money is less than what we have been getting, so also the reality is, if they read the documents attached, that most of the expenditure is going to be made after the year 1997, which means we have a long time to go yet to see what effect that expenditure is going to have.

The other reality, Mr. Speaker, in this agreement is that this is the comprehensive transportation package that will address the full concerns of the Province until the year 2004, and we have agreed to that and we have signed it. This is the comprehensive package. Mr. Speaker, that says that there will be no other package, that in terms of transportation money, there is no more. That for fifteen years, this is the total amount of money that is going to be available for transportation. That is the reality.

This Memorandum of Understanding also indicates that any obligations there may be on the part of the federal government,

with regards to the railway, are now totalling forgiven, written off, forgotten about, and that there is no possibility after the signing of this agreement that we can get something like a maintenance agreement from the federal government over the long term. We have signed away our rights under the Terms of Union. So, Mr. Speaker, these are the realities in here.

The perception members opposite are going to try to create through their advertising program. So I wish that everybody in Newfoundland could get a copy of this Memorandum of Understanding and then, of course, they would understand exactly what the railway deal is about.

Another deception, Mr. Speaker, has to do with unemployment in this Province. We always hear members opposite trying to create the perception that things are getting better all of the time. That things are not only getting better, but it is looking pretty good.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out something. I have taken some of the government's unemployment figures and done a little bit of work with. In March 1988, there was a labour force of 227,000 people in the Province. If you add on the discouraged workers, the workers who are no longer looking for work, which are 58,500, you will get a real labour force of 285,5000 people. There were 177,000 employed. Of these who were employed, 22,000 were simply part-time workers and these are not part-time, full-time either, just ordinary part-time workers. So the total full-time workers 155,000 in the Province.

Mr. Speaker, if you add to that the number of people in this Province who are working on the make-work jobs, I am not talking about the part-time jobs now, I am talking about the make-work jobs that are full-time while they are working, if you subtract these from the real workers of the Province you will get the real count of full-time workers in the Province which is 125,000 because there are probably 30,000 people on make-work jobs in the Province right now. So you get a real time full-time worker count of 125,000. So out of a labor force of 285,000, you get full-time workers, 125,000. That means that our employment rate is 44 per cent, our unemployment rate, the real unemployment rate was 56 per cent in March.

Mr. Speaker, that is the reality, and yet at the end of March and April, you heard the Premier and members opposite say how wonderful it was, 'The employment picture in this Province was wonderful. It was better than it was sometime in the past, sometime last year or the year before. Therefore, we were making tremendous progress.'

That is the perception they are trying to create, as opposed to the reality. I wish that everyone in this Province could see the reality and be able to ignore the perception.

Another area where I feel there has been a confusion of reality, and this is one that perhaps has not been brought up in the House before. It is in the area of equalization payments. We have so many times been told we are getting - this past year - an increase in equalization payments and how wonderful that was, as if this was something to be proud

of. Well, Mr. Speaker, there are two aspects of equalization payments I would like to deal with in the few minutes I have left.

First of all, when the equalization payments go up it means the economy of this Province is worse. That is what it means. It has been worse over the last three years, and has been worse in relation to how the other provinces in Canada are getting on during the same period of time. The equalization payments, as the ex Minister of Finance knows, are done on thirty-seven indicators. There is a six province average. Well, it has changed since the minister was there. It is done on a six province average of these indicators and if you fall below, you get made up to that average and if you are above you get it taken away.

DR. COLLINS:

That is not so.

MR. BAKER:

Well, things may have changed.

If the other provinces in the average fair better than we do over a period of time, we get our equalization payments increased. So an increase in equalization payments is an indication that we have been doing so much more poorly than the other provinces, in spite of the kick-starts and all that kind of thing that the minister is responsible for, in spite of that, it is an indication we have been doing worse.

But I would like to point out something else to the minister. We have not, since the concept of equalization was actually discussed, decided upon and written down, we have not been getting our share of equalization

anyway. The reason we have not been getting it, Mr. Speaker, has to do with the basic services available in this Province.

The theory of equalization says that the central government provides money to the areas of the country to make sure that the basic services, water, sewer, this kind of thing, the infrastructure, can be provided to a national level without undue levels of taxation. So, that is the statement.

Also if the minister were to go back a little further he would realize that and this is the statement in the Constitution in 1982, okay, so I am using that as a starting point more or less, but if you go back further than that, you realize that when the concept first was acted upon, now we have had equalization for almost forever, since Canada began in the country because we have had unemployment insurance, we have had family allowances and that is a form of equalization —

DR. COLLINS:

(Inaudible) other forms.

MR. BAKER:

Yes, other forms. But when the first attempt came to bring these forms together, the level of municipal services for instance was taken into account, Mr. Speaker, and what happened was that the idea was the federal government would take over the debt that the provinces had in relation to the level of services they now have and there would be a fresh start.

The problem in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, is we never did have a start, really. The nature of our Province is such that we were well

behind the rest of Canada in terms of municipal infrastructure, in terms of water and sewer, roads, well behind. So we did not start off with an even playing field.

Also, Mr. Speaker, if the theory of equalization is to work, and if we are to get what we should get, then there should be some allowance in the equalization formula for the difficulty of installing these municipal services.

If you compare this Province, let us say, with Saskatchewan, it is much more difficulty to put in the infrastructure here than it would be in many of the other provinces. Therefore, built into the formula for equalization, should be a degree of difficulty or an extra factor associated with the cost of putting in the municipal services. It should be put in there.

The point I am trying to make is this. I am glad the ex-Minister of Finance understands what I am saying because it was not very long ago I asked a question about that very thing to the present Minister of Finance (Mr. Windsor) in this House. No, I believe, I asked the ex-Minister of Finance, one of the Ministers of Finance, I asked a question on that very thing. I believe it was the present Minister of Finance and the answer I got indicated, number one: he did not believe what I was saying; number two: he did not know and did not understand what I was saying; and, number three: he did not care very much about it anyway. Now this is the implication that I got from the answer.

The ex-Minister of Finance should have had a committee, a

federal-provincial group working on this very problem. There should be people studying this to get some kind of a factor to work into our equalization payments so we can get the \$100s of millions that we should have been getting since 1957. There should be people working on this right now. I asked the Minister of Finance if, in fact, this was being worked on and all I got was an evasion.

I would say that this is an indication of incompetence. It is an indication of lack of concern. If the concern is there, it is an indication of procrastination obviously. This is something which should have been worked on, or should have been worked on for years, and certainly somebody should be working on right now, Mr. Speaker.

So, confidence in the government: No, Mr. Speaker, I do not have it. I do not have it, and with very good reason.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, I know you told me my time is just about up and I have an awful lot of other things I would like to explain and like to associate in the same way. I would like, for instance, to deal with Hibernia, and the perception versus the reality. I would like to deal with Sprung and the perception versus the reality. Mr. Speaker, I do not have time to do.

I would like to conclude by saying this government, in dealing with the major issues of this Province, has ignored the reality and tried to create the perception. It has all been perception.

One year we have protection under the constitution, the next year we do not, a posturing perception; one year we do not want factory freezer trawlers, the next year we let them come, perception versus reality; one year we decry all kinds of money that has been wasted, the next year we fund the greenhouse; one year we say, 'We will get absolute control over Hibernia, we will control the development, we want to own it,' and the next year we sign an agreement that says, 'No, we did not really mean that,' the perception and the reality.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this government, if they hope to get the confidence of the Newfoundland people again are going to have to make some change in the way they have been operating, because perception as reality only works for so long.

Eventually the reality becomes the perception and that is when this government get in trouble.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, just a very quick word. I think we had a very important address here tonight. I am going to study Hansard later.

That member has potentialities for leadership. He knows the issues.

There is a certain amount of grasp of what is important. It is not facade, it is not shadows which we so often get from over there. That member, I would say, has potentialities that go beyond what we see normally across the way.

Now, he is not the only one. I think the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) also, because of his experience in the House, has tremendous potentiality. He is being overshadowed. I do not know why. I do not know what he had done to do that, and certainly the member who just sat down, I think -

MR. BAKER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

If the minister would forget about this silly closure stuff he has in, I would be glad to expound for four or five days even, if necessary.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order.

DR. COLLINS:

I merely wanted to say I enjoyed the member's remarks, and I mean it quite sincerely. He has made some very good points -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS:

- and the more points of that nature we see from the other side, I think, the more the business of this Province will advance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. GULLAGE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Waterford - Kennmount.

MR. GULLAGE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is a real pleasure to be able to speak to the non-confidence motion. Firstly, I would like to address some of the concerns in Waterford - Kennmount and relate some of those concerns to some of the debate that has taken place recently in the House.

I would suggest that perhaps the number one issue during the recent campaign in watershed Kennmount

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. GULLAGE:

- was the unemployment picture in the Province. In that campaign the most frequently mentioned topic was unemployment, particularly, and not exclusively, but certainly particularly the youth unemployment and the concerns of young people. They frequently asked me, 'What is my future? Is there any opportunity for living in Newfoundland? Is there any possibility that I will get a job when I graduate from high school, trade school, or the university?'

That was, without a doubt, the most difficult question for me to answer because it was difficult to say, if not impossible to say, given the mandate of this government and the fact that so many of our youth have been leaving the Province for employment, I found it very difficult to give an answer that could in any way give those young

people any confidence that they had a future beyond graduation.

I found it even more shocking recently when it was announced by the Cabot Institute that they were eliminating many of their courses, courses that could have been accessed by these same young people, courses such as clerk accounting, clerk typing, stenography, word processing, electrical, electrical apprentice, heavy equipment repair, barber, stylists, and so on, being just eliminated on the basis that they could be provided in other community colleges which could be accessed by these same potential students.

Mr. Speaker, you would have to think that if there is a need for these courses outside of the Cabot Institute in community colleges, the need should be met. Why not have it met and situate instructors in areas so that students could indeed take advantage of these courses?

Why would we think that students could travel beyond their home town? That is really what the government is asking them to do. With the demand for these courses, in fact they are asking them to travel to areas well beyond their home and with the great difficulty of accommodation.

So, Mr. Speaker, I still do not see an answer to a young person who would ask me what their future might be. We certainly are not on the right track with career development when we try to decentralize education to the detriment of one area versus another where you would think that if there is a demand in a given area, that demand would be looked after in that area, and indeed in

any area where the demand is there, that instructors be provided. Rather than that, Mr. Speaker, we tend to be eliminating instructors and eliminating courses. I have seen no evidence to the contrary.

In fact, most of us have probably received letters of confirmation from instructors and students verifying the numbers and identifying the concern they have for the elimination of their jobs, elimination of their places as students in these courses.

The other area of concern that is obvious in St. John's, in Waterford-Kenmount to a great degree, but certainly not exclusively to Waterford-Kenmount, is the need to bring our services up to standard, to add water and sewer services where in fact, believe it or not, they are still not available in the urban area of St. John's. I know the government has announced some funding, but funding that should have been provided years ago when the City was expanded, and very little was heard, Mr. Speaker, when these areas were annexed about the need to provide adequate funding. Funding was provided to supposedly accommodate a phase in so that the annexed areas could be brought up to City standards, but the funding was so inadequate that we have had to bring these areas along by way of adding artesian wells in many cases, providing temporary services which should not have had to be accommodated given the annexation to the City and given the fact that all of these areas were substandard and without services in many cases and had been so for years.

Only now, in this recent budget, is the government beginning to

recognize to any substantial degree that we are simply spending dollars as a stop gap measure, providing artesian wells, as an example, to many, many homeowners in areas where it is very, very difficult for these wells to work because of mineral content and other reasons, and wells which are going to have to be replaced by water systems eventually in any case.

Hopefully, Mr. Speaker, not just in these annexed areas, but also in Waterford-Kenmount as it expands into the acreage now unserved, it will be done in a proper fashion and that we will, wherever possible, not just spend dollars on temporary measures such as wells and septic tanks, but indeed recognize that that is no longer acceptable, whether it is an urban area or an rural area. People will demand water and sewer services eventually in any case.

There are too many examples, Mr. Speaker, throughout the Province in small communities that have become incorporated, or demanded incorporation and received it, who were willing to accept wells and septic tanks because that is all they had, some did not even have that, some still do not have that, but eventually, knowing full well, the incorporation, of course, being approved by the government, but knowing full well that the time would come when they would demand water and sewer services comparable to areas that received them in all other areas of the Province.

I think that is the reality, Mr. Speaker, and I think we should recognize it and try to address it in the future, and try to make councils aware that proper and adequate water and sewer services

are demanded by all their citizens and we should, wherever possible, try to meet those demands upfront by way of co-operation and cost-sharing, whatever means is possible between the provincial and municipal governments involved.

Mr. Speaker, again staying with my district for a moment, Waterford - Kenmount, of course, has probably the largest number of railway workers living in it versus any other district in the Province.

Of the 655 railway workers dramatically affected, I say 'dramatically' because that is true, they still do not know really where they stand. Many of whom I have talked to, many of whom have called me are still hoping that the stated announcement that they will be looked after is in fact reality, is in fact true, but to this day they have still not received a breakdown of how their benefits will come out, how they will be looked after, particularly as far as employment is concerned. No doubt that will be forthcoming.

But my concern is with the 315 workers, I think that is the figure, almost half of the total number of railway workers affected by the railway deal who live in St. John's West, the majority of them, and a good number of the 315 are in Waterford - Kenmount. Indeed, the employment of these railway workers, or if they are qualified by way of age and service, the proper retirement, the proper settlement package so they can ease themselves into early retirement in many cases is probably the most important area of the railway agreement.

I do not think anybody would argue that looking after these 655

workers has to be considered a priority and hopefully as the agreement seems to imply, they will indeed be satisfactorily looked after.

I have great concern with the railway agreement from many points of view, not the least of which is the railway lands that are effected, railway lands that we have no idea where we stand as far as their disposition is concerned.

All we hear is that the lands will be transferred over from the federal to the provincial government, lands which are obviously going to be need by all of the cities and towns directly involved to help them bring their economy back, help them replace the loss of a presence such as the railway, a major presence in the case of St. John's, I suppose, next to the port itself and probably just as much as the port itself, the railway has been our most important industry.

DR. COLLINS:

The drydock, the port and the railway.

MR. GULLAGE:

Well, okay, the port and the railway. A combination of the two has been vitally important to St. John's, and now it appears we have lost a major portion of the railway certainly, granted to be replaced by port activity to a large degree. But it is going to be a major loss.

The urban area of St. John's and Mount Pearl does not have a great deal of primary industry, unlike many other areas of the Province. We have a fishing industry to some degree, granted a very good fishing industry, but per capita

our fishing industry cannot be compared with many, many communities throughout the Province that depend almost 100 percent on the fishing industry. We certainly do not have a lumber industry. We are basically a service or government area. I think, it has always been recognized that way. Being the capital city, of course, has its advantages; being the seat of government has its advantages, but we need all the industry we can access. Without the primary industries available to us, with the exception of the fishery, we are going to find it very difficult to replace the formidable presence of the railway down through the years.

The railway has meant a major contribution to St. John's in particular but indeed to the entire Avalon region because of the connections with the various communities and the movement of freight and so on, indeed, beyond the Avalon because the freight movement went beyond the Avalon Peninsula. We are now going to see that freight movement, of course, be moved up to the highway, and moved up, Mr. Speaker, not after a phase in period, but moved up onto the highway immediately, because we are already beginning to see, as everybody can witness by going down and having a look at the harbour facilities, that tractor-trailer traffic is already started, and started well in advance of what we thought would be the start date. The start date that was -

MR. BAIRD:

Maybe you did not think.

MR. GULLAGE:

Maybe we did not. I think we all

thought, Mr. Speaker, that the start date was too early in any case, and now it is moved back even further to immediate versus September the 1st, with no phase-in period. It has an immediate impact. For every tractor-trailer that goes on the highway, these figures have been verified, is the equivalent of 3,000 to 4,000 cars in its potential impact and ultimate damage to the highway as we move these tractor-trailers onto an already inadequate system.

Anybody who has travelled the highway to any degree would have witnessed the frightening trip across the Province. If you travel across the entire Province, you are literally taking your life in your hands having to face the number of tractor-trailers that cross Newfoundland every day, on a highway that was never, never meant for the kind of traffic it is taking. It is a highway that in most areas, with some exceptions, is totally and completely inadequate, and has been in need of upgrading for years and only now, Mr. Speaker, have we seen that part of the \$800 million is being faced off against upgrading the existing Trans-Canada and secondary roads that access the Trans-Canada Highway. It is money that should have been spent years ago, and even now will not be spent for some years. It will be spent in bits and pieces.

I would suggest that the \$5 million and the \$10 million and the figures that span out over the fifteen years, eventually spending the \$800 million or the \$400 million better said, in new money, will probably be spent in maintenance. By the time we get around to really seeing any

results by way of adding to the existing Trans-Canada Highway, we will probably have to spend the \$400 million in question in maintenance, maintenance of the highway as we see it today.

Certainly it is going to take a lot of dollars unless we can rewrite the agreement, which hopefully will have to take place, rewrite the agreement to expand the \$400 million available for the existing highway and secondary roads and expand the \$400 million available for additional roads, additional two lanes that are not going to be across the Province, Mr. Speaker, but are only going to be in areas where it has been indicated by the government if the traffic is the greatest.

MR. BAIRD:

It is a good thing Andy Wells is not here tonight, you would be sat down by now.

MR. GULLAGE:

Yes, I am quite sure. Did you ever see that happen?

Mr. Speaker, there is no question that -

MR. BAIRD:

Dorothy is coming, she wants you to drive her home.

MR. GULLAGE:

The additional two lanes are going to present an immediate challenge to this government as they try to upgrade the Trans-Canada Highway to bring the secondary roads up to a standard that, I suppose, you can only compare right now with the horse and buggy days, some of them are so bad. They are trying to bring up those secondary roads and the existing Trans-Canada to a standard is going to be a challenge to this government as it

tries to do it within adequate dollars over the next ten or fifteen years.

It is scandalous to think, Mr. Speaker, that this government would have agreed and would have signed an agreement which could only have been signed for political reasons, not just provincial political reasons, but also federal political reasons, knowing that -

MR. BAIRD:

Why do you not call (inaudible) and ask them what they think about it?

MR. GULLAGE:

- a federal election is imminent -

MR. BAIRD:

(Inaudible) baptized.

MR. GULLAGE:

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if this is not an indication of something to come, of an agreement we might see next week. We thought we would see it this week, but next week with Hibernia, an agreement that is going to be even more important, Mr. Speaker, to the federal Tories as they get ready for an election.

We all hear rumours of Quebec and what they might be getting out of the Hibernia deal. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we are going to see another railway agreement when the Hibernia announcement is finally, finally announced?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. GULLAGE:

Mr. Speaker, if this government thought that the railway agreement was a potential campaign issue and that Hibernia, if it is a similar

agreement, is a potential campaign issue then I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, we are a long, long way -

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. GULLAGE:
- from an election, Mr. Speaker, if those two issues are considered important.

Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to speak over the last fifteen or twenty minutes on this issue. I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that this budget will see changes, Mr. Speaker, we will have to see changes in any case because to survive with a budget such as this, given the costs that are coming to this Province down the road, is going to be literally impossible to do. I would hope that if an election is called shortly -

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. GULLAGE:
a new government, Mr. Speaker, will bring in a budget which will be adequate to cover these excessive costs.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that a new government, a Liberal government, will bring in a budget that will be adequate to cover these excessive costs that we are going to have to take on as a new government.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:
Well, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to add our own twenty minutes worth to this particular debate. I thought I would spend the time going back and forth with the arguments that have been coming forth from both sides over the last couple of days and prior to that, the last week or so when we were involved with this budget debate, and the debate in general.

Mr. Speaker, I thought it would be worthwhile to deal with what are obviously two diametric opposed views of what the economy of Newfoundland is like and therefore what the budget should have been. To give a sort of a shorthand to it, I am going to say that what we are getting from the Leader of the official Opposition is, to use a better word, the doom and gloom scenario. So we will call him the doom and gloom man. What we are getting from the PC side or the government side is what would I call the sweetness and light scenario in that everything is all right.

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, if we have two completely opposite views of it, then we have a situation in which neither of them or both of them cannot be correct. And, I think, similar to both situations like this, there is a degree of accuracy on both sides and there is a degree of exaggeration, and there is a degree of, quite frankly, almost delivered falsehood on both sides.

What are the things we are hearing from the government? The government is saying that things

are turning around well, that there is an increase in the amount of employment in the Province, that there is a decrease in the unemployment rate, that there are increases in the retail sales sector, especially among cars, the price of fish was up last year and there is generally an economic turnaround and they themselves will take the credit for having put in place the policies to accomplish that.

On the other side what we get from the Liberal Opposition is that there is as much unemployment now as virtually as there has ever been, it is at the highest level of any Province in Canada, I think their numbers are 18,000 individuals who have left the Province between 1981 and 1986, and that mismanagement on the part of the government on this side is the primary reason for this particular set of economic circumstances.

I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that neither of those visions are true. Both of them are misconceptions of what is going on and both of them I think hold an exalted place for the influence of this particular Legislature and this particular government and its ability to influence the economy of this Province. I think that is partially our problem.

We actually believe that our government has the financial, the fiscal, and the monetary levers, as they are often called, in order to produce full employment within this Province, and in order to make it a very prosperous economy. I would argue that in the classic tradition of fiscal and monetary policies, we do not have that power. We just do not

have it.

For the government to take credit for increases in employment, for the government to take credit for decrease in unemployment, it is to take credit for something which they had virtually no control over whatsoever. For the Liberal Opposition to accuse them of mismanaging the economy and allowing the unemployment rate to stay high and out-migration to occur, is to blame them for things they also had very marginal control over at best.

The analogy, I think, that is most appropriate is to compare the Province of Newfoundland to a sail boat, and one that is out on the ocean and is sailing along sometimes in front of the breeze, sometimes towards it, sometimes in a hurricane, sometimes becalmed.

Quite frankly, the most important thing in terms of our progress is not so much how efficiently the sails are handled or how well the rudder is manipulated, but which way the wind is blowing, how strong it is blowing, and the overall design of the craft when it started.

The fact, Mr. Speaker, is that the policies in Ottawa, the fiscal and monetary policies that currently are in place in Ottawa have much, much greater bearing on our unemployment rate here than anything this particular provincial government can do. If it would ever stand up and admit modestly it only has a certain amount that it can do, maybe we would be a little bit more charitable to them when they start complaining about the high unemployment rate, and maybe we will be a little bit more consoling when the fact is that

they do actually accomplish a few things, or not accomplish a few things.

The problem is, if you look at the unemployment rate, and you look at the out-migration rate, the Liberal Party has it all wrong. The fact is, the numbers are much greater in terms of out-migration and even they are contributing.

They say, for example, that there are 18,000 people between 1981 and 1986 who left.

MR. WELLS:

No, no.

MR. FENWICK:

That is not true?

MR. WELLS:

1985 to 1986 (inaudible).

MR. FENWICK:

Excuse me, Mr. Speaker. When I finish, Mr. Speaker, the teacher over there can get up and do whatever lessons he wants, but right now I would like to go back over the numbers I think they have been badly misquoting.

If you go and look at the numbers between 1981 and 1986, the census figures, you will find they are virtually identical. About 600 more people in the Province in the 1986 census than in 1981. If you look at out-migration, they claim there is approximately 33,000 people left and there are about 16,000 or 17,000 people who came in and I think that is where they got their numbers. You just subtract the two and you will find about 17,000 or 18,000, that should be the net out-migration.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, if you go and look at all the numbers concerned, you will find that

there are massive numerical numbers with those numbers that indicate that quite likely instead of 33,000 people leaving the Province in those five years, it is more like 44,000. Quite frankly, the immigration figures being used are calculated on things such as the filing of income tax tables and family allowance cheques and so on and so forth, and all of these have a certain degree of error built into them, because you take out-migration, subtract in-migration, if you take births and subtract deaths, and you add that from 1981, there is supposed to be 11,000 more people than show up in 1986. The only explanation is that there were about 11,000 more people emigrating or leaving this Province than there was coming in on the actual figures themselves. If you add up the last two years and assume things are going pretty much in the same direction, I would argue with you that there is approximately 60,000 people who left this Province in the seven years from 1981 to the present day. That number I think is reasonably good.

Now, I should also mention that about 20,000 did return or at least 20,000 in-migrants occurred as well. But the fact of the matter is the numbers are serious and they are obviously the cause of a whole bunch of other social problems we will meet down the road.

For example, the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn) will tell you that our 140,000 people in school today in ten years will dwindle down to 90,000 or 99,000 people; those 40,000 students who will not be there in ten years will create massive restructuring problems necessary in our

education system.

It is by way of saying that the Liberal Party has at least identified the major problem. To me the unemployment rate is the thing that we have a hard time with, but it is the out-migration rate that is the real worry because that means we are not having young people coming along to the work force in the future in order to provide the employment required to, quite frankly, when we retire on our pensions, to keep us supported, which of course we need.

But having said that, Mr. Speaker, I have to say that I do have a lot of sympathy for the government because frankly the government does not have any control whatsoever over monetary policy in this country.

It does not set the interest rates. And the interest rates as we know, and the exchange rate between Canada and the United States, probably has a greater effect on employment in this Province than anything that government can possibly do in its Budget, because, quite frankly, if we have a seventy cent dollar, we can sell tons of fish, tons of iron ore and tons of paper. If we have a dollar that is equal to the American dollar, God help us all. We will have incredibly difficult times if we have to buck that kind of thing. With the dollar at eighty-two cents and climbing, we may have some real problems in the future in terms of our paper, iron ore and our fishing industry.

The other thing, as the people know, interest rates are critical. If the interest rates go back to the 1981 levels of 18 per cent, 19 per cent and 20 per

cent, then again it will be difficult to finance all our enterprises and that in its own self will cause massive unemployment in this Province no matter what this government does or that government does or this government does.

The fact of the matter is those major economic monetary factors, not controlled by us, and so pervasive that in a sense it is an absolute falsehood to say we have that much control over the actual day to day control of the level of our economy.

But, Mr. Speaker, there are other things that can be done. I used before the example that we are like a sail boat in the ocean and the typhoon or the hurricane or the becalming or the winds are much more critical to that boat and its direction than are anything else. In a sense, the weather is being controlled by Ottawa and even to a greater extent, perhaps by international trade winds that we have little if any control over.

So it is also very difficult to go to this government and say in 1982 and 1983 and 1984 we had tremendously high unemployment because 1,000 people got laid off in Labrador West and we had disasters in the fishery and the paper industry could not sell paper. To blame them for that is wrong because that affected the rest of Canada, it affected the United States, it affected Europe, and it affected all the primary producers in the world.

The fact is, if they had no control over it and they should not have not taken the responsibility for it. The fact of the matter is the depression we

entered into in 1982-83, we should have come out of in 1984, as the rest of Canada did, but that did not occur and I would argue, Mr. Speaker, that that is the place where this government is culpable. It is not that we went into the recession, it is not that we had the unemployment, it is not that we had the interest rates that hammered us.

What we are culpable for is that our economy is so reliant on fish, on iron ore, on paper, and those other essential primary industries, that we did not have a diversity that helped Quebec, Ontario, parts of Western Canada, New Brunswick, and Manitoba, to get out of that depression much more rapidly than we could. That, Mr. Speaker, is where I fault not only the PC government over there but the Liberal Opposition because, while we are getting the gloom and doom from the Leader of the Official Opposition, we have yet to get one concrete proposal on how he would change the way in which this government does business.

As a matter of fact, I would argue to you that he is ideologically constrained and financially constrained to follow the same sets of policies this government follows, because, quite frankly, he is going after the same supporters! [F Harry Steele, Craig Dobbin, and all the rest of the entrepreneurs in this Province are the ones who are supporting the PCs, they are the ones the leader of the Official Opposition is also going after. They are the people that he wants to support him. It is the Harry Steele who is already supporting him. It is the Harry Steele who gave him \$2000 worth of free hotel accommodations at the Mount Peyton

during his election campaign. Harry Steele does won one third of that hotel because we checked it. It is down in the Registry and still checked that way.

Mr. Speaker, I want to show you something right now. Look at this. I give you a copy of **The Gulf News** from Port aux Basques. If you can stomach the ugly picture on this page what you will see is a large article, exactly the way it was drafted by the Liberal Opposition, with a picture of the Leader of the Opposition, run in **The Gulf News**. Now, there is nothing wrong with that, Mr. Speaker, because **The Gulf News** probably wanted his opinion on the railway deal. But look at this:

This one comes from the **Corner Brook Humber Log**, another paper owned by Harry Steele. Look, exactly the same picture, exactly the same article, exactly the same typos in it! Look at this one: This one comes from **The Georgian** in Stephenville, another one, but they dropped the picture. Actually, they had two women up there which were much more attractive and that is probably why they did it. It is the same article, Mr. Speaker!

What am I saying to you? I am saying to you that Harry Steele owns the Robinson Blackmore papers and here is three of them running exactly the same article, on exactly the same issue, throughout their entire chain.

You guys have been asking me, who owns the Leader of the Official Opposition? I tell you this is pretty good, as we say in this House, prima facie evidence that somebody has a vested interest in making sure that that boring,

long-winded article he wrote on it, that quite frankly I doubt if anybody in their right mind would read all the way through, has certainly been distributed throughout the chain by somebody who clearly wants to support them.

I am suggesting to you people on the other side that that is difficult times for you because I know Harry Steele, last Summer, donated a thousand dollars, I think, to Tom Hickey's campaign who was the PC candidate. You are losing your support base and you guys had better start worrying about that.

But the point for policy is important because what it means is Harry Steele will not allow him to do anything different than he has allowed you to do! He is telling you that there is a certain series of policies the business community in this Province wants to see implemented and they are now telling the Leader of the Official Opposition they want him to implement it later as well!

I am saying to you the policies themselves are wrong. It is a reliance on these multi-nationals who, by the way, do not pay us any taxes at all. Go and have a look at your budgets. I was looking back through. I wanted to find Abitibi-Price. Do you know how much corporate income taxes and forest-use taxes they paid to this Province in 1983? Less than \$1.5 million. Do you know how much paper we sold in that year? What was it 'len'? Was it \$275 million worth or in that range.

We are talking about less than \$3 million from the two paper companies in our Province, yet they sold almost \$300 million

worth of paper and paid nothing for the privilege of doing it. That is because, quite frankly, we have a very warped method of paying our taxes!

We have 12 per cent sales tax but we have a very low corporate income tax. It is high in percentage but its effect is almost negligible because we are looking at Abitibi Price, we are trying to tax them. They have two mills here. They have a whole bunch of mills right across Canada and between the bookkeeping jigs and reels, they do not pay us any tax at all.

But, we, on the contrary, if you talk to the Minister of Forest Resources (Mr. Aylward) he will tell you, this year we, provincially and federally, provide \$30 million to help support the forest industry in this Province. But we have nothing for it. Nothing! Nothing incorporate income taxes, nothing in any kind of forest-use taxes, nothing in forest management taxes. Nothing!

MR. SIMMS:

(Inaudible) thousand jobs.

MR. FENWICK:

Well, yes, and they are the ones who has paid the taxes. God bless them! The people who get the most tax for this Province are the collective bargaining agents for the workers there because they manage to bring their salaries up a little above the average so they can pay their income tax. Otherwise, we would really be in trouble.

But the people who use the resource and make a fortune on it do not pay anything. That is the deliberate policy of this

government over here and I guarantee you it will be the deliberate policy of that party over there because, as I showed you, the same people who tell you or give you a limit on the options you can have in your budget, are the same people who give them a limit on it.

We want to change it. We are going to argue that we will find a way that Abitibi Price will pay for \$30 million worth of gifts it gets. At least, we want to break even with them, that they will pay for their roads and their spray programs; they will pay for the silviculture programs; they will pay for the nursery. At least break even for God's sake! Let us not give them \$30 million subsidy when it is a company which sells \$300 million worth of paper a year. At least, we can do something along those lines.

The other thing we are trying to say to you is that you also tax heavily all along the other lines. Twelve per cent sales tax. I think that is an absolute crime. Someday I hope to be able to live to when we can actually reduce the 12 per cent sales tax along the line. But at 1 percentage point for \$40 million, suggesting that we can unilateral lower it is absolutely totally irresponsible. But, we could have at least done the minimum the federal government did.

What did the federal government do? They say for anybody under \$15,000 a year, we will give them a credit so the sales tax will not hit as hard on them. Why cannot we do the same thing in this budget? Why in this budget did we not say that people under a certain limit will receive on their tax returns \$50 or \$100 or

\$150 or whatever it was to reduce the impact of the 12 per cent sales taxes. That is the kind of creative use which could have been done in this particular budget and that, if it was done, would actually help the individuals there.

So what am I saying to you? I am saying that I think that to blame this government for the desperate shape we are in is somewhat false in the sense that they had no more control over that than the captain of a ship has over a hurricane that buffets the ship itself. But, I am also telling you we are control of the ship and we are control of the design of the ship. I would argue to you that the shape of our ship is wrong.

Relying too much on the primary industries has given us a very desperate kind of economy that swings up and down much too radically. We need to develop much more the co-operative industries in this Province. I say that because I believe in intrinsically that they are a better kind of organization than any of the others we have.

Think, if you will, of what Eastern Provincial Airways would have been like if it had been a co-operatively-owned organization. It would still be in Gander to this very day.

Think of what would happen if Terra Nova Tel was co-operatively-owned. It would still be in Gander to this day and there would be no question of selling it, no question of trying to raise the yield on it by selling it to some other entrepreneur.

We think the long term development

strategy of this Province is to take the ownership of the resources, turn them back to the people of this Province, and give them a chance to develop it, not the entrepreneurs like the Sprungs and the Abitibi Prices and the Iron Ore Company of Canada and the rest of them. They do not have a single concern for us. They pay virtually no taxes. They get away with a free lunch.

They are, as David Lewis once said, 'the corporate welfare bums' of this Province and it is about time they paid their fair share.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LONG:
Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):
The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

First, I just want to make a comment or two about the remarks made about the member who just took his seat. I am rather intrigued by hearing the hon. gentleman talk about the positions taken by both parties. He knows the position that is taken by hon. members opposite because they have proven their position over the last number of years, but on our own position, he is speculating. He is sure that that is going to be the Liberal position.

Well, I will outline to him in the next few minutes what will be the Liberal position. We do not need the hon. member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) to tell us what our

position will be or what he would like to see. I will tell him in a few minutes what our position will be, Mr. Speaker, what the position of this party will be when we form the government of this Province.

He talked about the economic situation of this Province and talked about how we are both at extremities. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Wells), he says, is all gloom and doom and the Party over there is all sweetness and light. But somehow he sees a position in the middle somehow, he is not at either end of these extremities, he is in the middle. I would almost venture to say, if he were comparing us to a turkey sandwich, the hon. member would want to be the turkey.

Mr. Speaker, I can tell hon. members this party knows where it sits. This party, much more than that, knows where it stands and we know where we are going.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker, I do not want to get into a position of denegrating upright citizens in this Province, but I will tell the hon. gentleman this: The Liberal Party, in the true tradition of Liberalism, will neglect no segment of the Newfoundland society. We will neglect no segment of that society, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:
Yes, we will talk to the business community, Mr. Speaker, we will get their ideas on the development of this Province, and we will talk to the educators of this Province,

and Mr. Speaker, we will talk to the poor and the underprivileged of this Province, and we will talk to the labour movement in this Province as well, and we will put together the ideas, the opinions and the suggestions of all segments of society and come up with a Liberal policy in the true tradition of Liberalism that has worked very well in this Province, that has worked in Canada, Mr. Speaker, that has produced high levels of employment, that has produced high levels of income. That is the route that we will take over the next few years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, we will not cater to any one group, not to any one group; we will not be bought by any one group of people in this Province, but we will, Mr. Speaker, liaison with all segments of society to ensure that this Province is moving, to ensure that every Newfoundlander has an equal opportunity, to ensure that every Newfoundlander can maximize their potential in this Province so we can have a happy and a prosperous society. That is where we are going. That is what Liberalism is all about and this is what this party is about, Mr. Speaker.

We will not allow anyone to speculate or misrepresent the policies of this Party to try and guess as to where we are going. As I said, we know where we are going. We are on a straight course, Mr. Speaker, and we are going to get there. We are going to convince the people of this Province that the Liberal policies advocated by this party are the fiscal policies and programmes that will get this Province moving

are the policies for the future of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, I want to come back to some comments that were made earlier by other members. I found most intriguing and amazing the comments made by the member for St. John's North about the railway. There was nothing ever uttered in this House so incredible as the comments made by that hon. gentleman, so incredible and so asinine that they do not deserve comment.

Imagine, Mr. Speaker, an asset like the Newfoundland Railway that was a constitutional right, if it meant nothing economically! If it meant nothing, it was a constitutional right, forming a part of the national transportation system of this country. The country was built on that national transportation system, and when we became a part of Canada, Mr. Speaker, we became a part of that national transportation system. To give that up for nothing, to give it away, Mr. Speaker, that is one thing, but to try and justify it is absolutely incredible. I will come back to that in a moment as I talk about the main objections we have with that particular deal, the sell-out of the Newfoundland Railway.

But I want to come back to 1898. I mentioned that a couple of days ago while I was speaking here. It was the other crucial period in our history when we ran into problems with the Newfoundland Railway. There are many situations which are very similar today to that situation ninety years ago. There are many circumstances, many things very similar to that situation. I just want to bring these similar

situations to the attention of hon. members.

In 1898 the government was in deep financial trouble, and the railway was causing a lot of financial problems. So the government wanted, in desperation, if they could get rid of the railway, it might give them a few extra bucks in the short-term.

So, Mr. Speaker, they did that in 1898. They gave away the railway for \$1 million to one single person, but not only did they give away the railway, they gave away practically all the communication system we had in those days, the telegraph system, the coastal boat system, the whole bit was given to this one person.

What is similar about these two situations, about 1898 and 1988? First of all, both governments were in a desperate financial situation, wanting to get their hands on more money if they could to try and get themselves re-elected. These were the similar circumstances. Number two: they were both Tory governments. In 1898 and 1988, it was two Tory governments which gave the Newfoundland Railway away, two Tory governments, and for two similar reasons, to get a few extra dollars.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is another situation which is very similar. In 1898, the people were in a frenzy, the people were hostile to the giving away of the Newfoundland Railway, and they looked to somebody whereby they could bring this hostility, to bring their feelings of disenchantment and discontentment to the government, and they found that in a political party. They found that in a certain political

party. That political party started exposing the flaws and weaknesses of that particular railway deal, and, Mr. Speaker, thus was born one of the most potent, one of the strongest, one of the most aggressive parties in that time. One of the most modern parties, as a matter of fact, in the whole British Commonwealth, Mr. Speaker, and that was the Liberal Party.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:

That was the Liberal Party in 1898 under the leadership of Sir Robert Bond.

Mr. Speaker, we have the same thing happening today. People have to find some way by which to express their hostility, their discontentment, and their dissatisfaction about a certain thing, or about any injustice they see, and today the same situation is arising. The people of Newfoundland are expressing their dissatisfaction and their discontentment with this railway deal through the Liberal Party of Newfoundland and Labrador! That is the similar circumstance, Mr. Speaker!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:

If I might carry on for a minute, the next big thing hon. members should listen to because it is very similar to what is happening. When the Liberals had their election in 1900, of course, they blew the Tories out of the water. But the next similar thing to happen, the next big issue to happen, and very similar today, the next big political issue after

the railway, after Sir Robert Bond got elected, was free trade. It was called in those days a reciprocity agreement.

Sir Robert Bond had tried on a previous occasion, as a matter of fact, to get reciprocity and nearly did it. I think it was called the Bond-Blaine Reciprocity Treaty. He nearly got it. He was not in government then, he was a minister in the previous government. Now that he was Premier, he started free trade again, but he ran into some large problems. Now, the Premier, I think, the other day - the hon gentlemen are wondering why I am going back in history. There is a reason for it, Mr. Speaker, because the Premier in talking about free trade a couple of days ago, blamed it on Britain and it was the fault of Britain that we did not get the free trade agreement.

Well, the Premier was over simplifying the thing, as he normally does. It was not necessarily Britain. It was also the United States who were fearful of what would happen to the fishermen in the New England States. It was also, then, Canada, and, of course, it was Canada which moved Britain actually to try and not bring in this free trade. But it was the United States in the final analysis, Mr. Speaker, with their Congressman, or their Senator, Henry Cabot Lodge, who really got up and spoke against free trade and it was not passed in the Senate. It was wiped out and we never heard of it any more.

Sir Robert Bond kept pressing, he really kept pressing, doing all sorts of things. We got into all kinds of situations. We made bad

feelings with the Americans which our Newfoundlanders did not want, particularly on the South Coast, the Southwest Coast, and the West Coast, all along the French Shore, he started making laws so the Americans could not fish here inside our three mile limit. Anyway, the upshot of it all was he completely turned off the Newfoundland people and Sir Robert Bond lost the next election as a result of free trade.

Mr. Speaker, I just brief hon. members on that because that is very close to our own history and what is happening now. One, the complete dissatisfaction of our people with the railway deal, a deal that is good for the federal government. It is a real steal for the federal government, this Newfoundland Railway, a real steal for the federal government.

Here they had an operation that was running them in the hole, \$40 to \$50 million a year, to say nothing about the total operation. It was running them in the hole if we can believe the projected figures. Now, if we multiply that by 15 and to not factor in inflation, any of those things, but to assume they were going to run into that kind of deficit for the next fifteen years. Take the lower figure of \$40 million and it is only reasonable to expect that the federal government would have given us fifteen times that figure, fifteen times \$40 million, which was their annual loss, taking the low side of it. That would have been \$600 million we should have received. What did we receive for our highways and the Trans-Canada Highway, \$405 million, Mr. Speaker.

So we can see by just looking at

these deficit figures what a deal it was for the federal government. Mr. Speaker, they signed away the railway, signed it away in which case over fifteen years we would be receiving \$405 million a year which averages out to \$27 million a year over that fifteen year period.

Now, Mr. Speaker, can anybody think of a period in our history with the Trans-Canada Highway, or the last ten, taking all the agreements we signed, that there was not a year when we did not get \$27 million, when there was not a time when all of the money allocated did not average out to \$27 million?

Mr. Speaker, the federal government are clearly the people who got the deal. They have now been alleviated of the problem of running, operating and maintaining the Newfoundland Railway and now they have been taken off the hook completely, simply by giving us \$405 million to upgrade the Trans-Canada Highway over the next fifteen years with no maintenance agreement.

Mr. Speaker, you do not have to be too much of a genius, you do not have to be a mathematical wizard to be able to see from that who got the better part of the deal, whether it is this government or whether it is federal government. Mr. Speaker, clearly the facts reveal that it was the federal government that got the better part of the deal. There is no question about that, Mr. Speaker, no question about it and we have taken on a financial burden.

We have taken on, Mr. Speaker, a financial load that is going to bear heavily on future generations of this Province in terms of the

maintenance of the highway. What time is maintenance going to start? Now, the Premier likes to think that maintenance is going to be cheaper as a result of the upgrading of our highways. What time will maintenance under this programme become our responsibility?

Mr. Speaker, it has started all ready. One only has to look at parts of the highway that have been done in the last year and the last two years, and maintenance has started all ready. So by the time fifteen years are up, Mr. Speaker, one can visualize how much maintenance this Province is going to be responsible for when the highway is finally completed and prior to that.

Mr. Speaker, it was a crime and a disgrace that this Province did not press for a constitutional right with respect to our transportation system in exchange for the loss of a constitutional right.

MR. KELLAND:

And refused it when it was offered.

MR. LUSH:

And refused it when it was offered.

Now, Mr. Speaker, secondly, why did they rush into this agreement and say that they were going to close the Newfoundland Railway as of September 1? As the member for Waterford-Kenmount (Mr. Gullage) mentioned, the process has started already, the closedown has started now, Mr. Speaker. It has started now. Why did they name a three month period to put all of this traffic on our highways when they are not ready to take all of the traffic that is going to be diverted to our highways, making them very unsafe for the motoring

public of this Province? Why did they not at least keep it in there for five years or ten years or even to the fifteen years when the highway was completed? That way it would give our highways a chance to be upgraded.

But, Mr. Speaker, they are going to divert all of that traffic immediately on our roads, on our Trans-Canada Highway which is not now up to scratch, not now up to par, that cannot take that traffic that is going to be diverted to it as a result of the closedown of the Newfoundland Railway.

Mr. Speaker, the arrangement the Province entered into with the federal government with the railway was condemned by every person of recognition in this Province. Every person, Mr. Speaker, with any understanding, with any appreciation, with an affinity for the transportation system of this Province condemned the kind of deal that hon. gentlemen entered into. Time and time again they recommended we not enter into a lump sum settlement. Time and time again that was recommended to them.

But, Mr. Speaker, much worse than going into a lump sum settlement, they went into a lump sum settlement all right, but took it over fifteen years. Mr. Speaker, hon. gentlemen condemned Churchill Falls. But I would ask hon. gentlemen, where do they think the money they have entered into, if inflation continues to go the way that it has been going over the last few years, what is that \$405 million going to be worth at the end of fifteen years? What is it going to be worth, Mr. Speaker, in fifteen years?

Now hon. gentlemen talk about

their reopener clause.

MR. FUREY:

Ah, what a joke!

MR. LUSH:

Now, if some hon. gentlemen in speaking will get up and tell me where it says in that reopener clause that the federal government has an obligation, that the federal government are bound to put extra monies into the Trans-Canada Highway at the end of eight years, Mr. Speaker, then I would have a different view of this.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, if hon. gentlemen can identify the exact words, the precise words which lay out, which identify the federal government's obligation to put more money into the Trans-Canada Highway, then that could be enlightening to the people of Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I ask hon. gentlemen where is the clout in this reopener clause? Does this have more effect than a Term of Union or two Terms of Union? Two Terms of Union were scuttled and rescinded at various periods in our history, Term 29 rescinded. Term 29 scuttled and rescinded by Mr. Diefenbaker, but brought back, enshrined again in the constitution by Mr. Pierson. And now, Mr. Speaker, Term 31.

So are hon. gentlemen saying that a clause in a Memorandum of Understanding has more authority, has more clout than Terms of Union? Mr. Speaker, they are trying to hoodwink the people of Newfoundland. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, who has been hoodwinked,

this government. They have been hoodwinked with this railway deal, one of the biggest giveaways, one of the biggest sell-outs in the history of Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, there is one other point I would like to mention in terms of why I am supporting this non-confidence motion, in addition to the economic malaise which this government has gotten this Province into. The highest unemployment in the country, Mr. Speaker, and the biggest giveaway ever in our history with respect to the Newfoundland Railway deal. We have the lowest, Mr. Speaker, form of public services in Newfoundland, lower than any other Province in Canada, and I refer to our municipal services, water and sewer.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder what time this government is going to deal with that problem? Were they successful in getting the money we should have gotten? Were they successful in striking the right deal with the transportation system, we may have been able to wrestle this giant of public services to the ground! We might have been able to do something about it. Well, Mr. Speaker, we cannot now, especially with \$43 million this year. Let me tell hon. members of the gravity and the seriousness of this problem by illustrating what the Federation of Municipalities stated a month or so ago.

They said, "In order to bring the level of public services up a par with that in other provinces in Canada, over the next five years, the Government of Newfoundland over the next five years would have to spend \$100 million a year." One hundred million dollars, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. LUSH:
- for the next five years!

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I may conclude, here is the next challenge for this government, but I expect it is going to be the challenge of another party. But here is the next challenge, Mr. Speaker, to go to the federal government and get monies, Mr. Speaker, to build up the infrastructure of this Province so that we can prosper. They now have a good reason to go because of the awful deal they got with the Newfoundland Railway deal, and here they can compensate and do something good for the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Fogo,

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, I do have a few words. It is a hard act to follow when you have to follow the member for Bonavista North. I can tell you that. It was not an act, it was a speech that came right from the bottoms of the soles of his shoes. Mr. Speaker, anytime that he gets in full flight, it is a hard act to follow in this legislature.

I do want to say a few words about the kind of debate that we are operating under here, the closure rule that we are operating under, the kind of severe restrictions we

are operating under.

But before I do, I cannot pass the remarks made by the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick), or Port au Port or St. George's, or wherever he is going to run. The flip-flop member. Mr. Speaker, we saw him standing in his place again this evening in his traditional fashion, in the same way as he did with NATO, we saw him stand in his place and at one point he was sympathizing with the government, they were doing a great job, and at another point they were wrong, and at another point the Liberals were right, at another point the Liberals were wrong. Now that is typical. I think the understanding was that he was only going to speak if the press were around.

Mr. Speaker, at least he did get out one point that the Liberals were right on. He agreed we were right on the principle that there has been 18,600 people leave this Province, he had the years wrong, but I think he got out the point that there is over 18,000 people left this Province in the last two or three years under the present administration, to go and seek work somewhere else.

He put me in mind somewhat of a man who is desperate, who has lost his credibility in recent weeks because of his behavior in this Legislature and who is desperate to somehow to take abroad somebody else and build up his own credibility, through innuendo.

His remarks about the newspaper article, well, did you ever see anything as low as that statement, or silly, ludicrous? I thought that the hon. gentleman knew how to handle the press. It is very, very obvious he does not know that

if you put together a story for most of the Robinson Blackmore papers and distribute it to them, they will print it word for word.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. TULK:
Yes, the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) is a prime example of it. He does it all the time. I could bet that we have seen in all the Robinson Blackmore papers articles printed by the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) in the same fashion.

But for him to stand in this Legislature and somehow suggest that because Harry Steele owns the Robinson Blackmore chain of papers, that all of the editors have been bought off by Harry Steele so that they can print the picture and the words of the Leader of the Opposition, that is a new low even for the member for Menihek. It is downright insulting to the editors of the Robinson-Blackmore chain across this Province.

But we have seen what this gentleman is capable of doing, to stand up and suggest that the government side of the House has been bought by the large corporations and the large businessmen in the Province and they are losing support and now it is all shifting to this side.

Well, we admit to him, Mr. Speaker, we admit to him that everybody in this Province, the labourer, the accountant, even members of the House, teachers in this Province, everybody, fishermen are contributing to the Liberal Party because they want to get rid of that crowd over there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

We admit that every person in the Province -

MR. TOBIN:

Is he a good Liberal?

MR. TULK:

Of course he is a good Liberal. Every person in this Province, every walk of life is contributing to the Liberal Party, but for that gentleman down there to stand and suggest that the large corporations control the Tory Party and control the Liberal Party, and that he somehow is not under anybody's control at all,

MR. LONG:

The ordinary people control our party.

MR. TULK:

The ordinary people of this Province, says the member for St. John's East (Mr. Long), well let me tell him that in 1985 in Twillingate, the member for Twillingate and two or three others, stood in a meeting of fisherman, where one particular person had made \$24 in a week and was forced to give \$10 to the Fishermen's Union so that they could pay for office space for the hon. gentleman from Menihek (Mr. Fenwick).

Now that is the kind of hypocrisy that comes from the two pink poodles down in the corner! That is the kind of stuff that we hear from the hon. gentlemen. Mr. Speaker, what nonsense, \$250,000 went from the Fishermen's Union into the coffers of the NDP Party.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

That is not true.

MR. EFFORD:

That is true. That is exactly right!

MR. TULK:

And for that gentleman to stand and suggest that somebody is under the control of somebody in this Legislature, he should turn back on and sneak out, as he usually does when there is a vote on.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Two hundred and fifty thousand dollars?

MR. TULK:

Two hundred and fifty thousand dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I think he has gone up to get his interview with CBC. Desperation has forced him, he wants to see his picture on the tube. If we had to complain about some media being controlled by a certain party, I suppose we could say something about the unions and CBC. I suppose we could, but we will not stoop that low. We will not stoop that low.

Let me turn to the debate we are now operating under, the kind of situation we are now operating under, Mr. Speaker. I do not have that much time.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman knows what we are about to discuss, what I am about to debate, Mr. Speaker, the kind of rule that the Government House leader has invoked today. Oh, I like the hon. gentleman very much as an individual, but as a Government House Leader (Mr. Simms) I think he is an abysmal failure.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the hon. gentleman as the Opposition House Leader, I have dealt with I guess three of them now, he is the third one -

MR. PATTERSON:

And nine leaders.

MR. TULK:

No, no, he is the third one, Judge Marshall as he now is, who used to be the member for St. John's East; Senator Ottenheimer, he is my Lord, Senator Ottenheimer -

MR. SIMMS:

Have you had lunch with him lately?

MR. TULK:

Not the judge, no, not the judge lately. -- who also was a very, very capable individual. Mr. Speaker, there is something happening in this legislature today which has not happened in the history of the legislature of this Province.

MR. SIMMS:

1984.

MR. TULK:

What?

MR. SIMMS:

Closure.

MR. TULK:

Closure on what?

AN HON. MEMBER:

On a labour bill.

MR. TULK:

Exactly right. There has never been closure in this House on a Budget Debate. Never, since the existence of a legislature in this Province! Why is that, Mr. Speaker? Why is it that

Government House Leaders have not invoked closure on a Budget Speech?

Because, Mr. Speaker, it goes to the very essence of why this Legislature exists. It controls the public purse of this Province and therefore, Mr. Speaker, the Opposition has to be given every opportunity and as much an opportunity as it needs to look at the Budget, the tax collection system, the revenue of this Province, and the expenditure of government. That is the very purpose of the Legislature.

He talked about the silly Interim Supply we offered him today. Now, the hon. gentleman said he would need two months to put that together. I believe him.

AN HON. MEMBER:

He said two weeks.

MR. TULK:

Two weeks.

MR. BAIRD:

Make up your mind.

MR. TULK:

I believe the hon. gentleman, that he would, because we see a Government House Leader who, out of sixty-six days that this House has been open, until today, sixty-six days this Legislature has sat this year, and we have spent six days on the Budget Debate, -

MR. SIMMS:

Thirty-five days on the Estimates.

MR. TULK:

- a total of six and one half opposition hours, and nine and a half hours for the whole House on a budget that looks at some \$3 billion worth of collection and

expenditures. When you look at a Government House Leader who wanted to have cash this evening so he could pay people tomorrow, when you look at that, Mr. Speaker, and realize that the last time that Government House Leader called the Budget Debate was on April 26, when you look at a Government House leader who finds that he has mismanaged this House so desperately that on the day before he has to have money, he comes in and tries to accuse the Opposition of keeping money from the civil servants, the widows, and the poor people of this Province. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman must learn that co-operation, if it is to exist, has to exist for the best interests of the people of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, I want to address one other thing the hon. gentleman, the President of Treasury Board, did in his few remarks in this debate, and that is his personal attack on the Leader of the Opposition. Now, that has been a trade mark of the government this year.

MR. BAIRD:

Oh, the Leader of the Leader of the Opposition did not attack the House leader, did he. Mr. Clean did not! Indeed he did not!

MR. FULK:

How is old landslide Baird doing this evening?

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition should be proud the Government House Leader and all the people on the other side have spent most of this session putting silly resolutions on the Order Paper attacking the integrity of the Opposition House Leader. He should be absolutely proud because if there is one characteristic I

have noticed in the nine years I have sat in this Legislature of the hon. gentleman opposite, if somebody threatens their base of power, then there is nothing they will not stoop to on a personal level. The Leader of the Opposition should be proud because they know, the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) knows, and he is very good at personal attack, the member for Bonavista South knows that the Leader of the Opposition will be the next Premier of this Province whenever an election is called.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

That is the real problem that the hon. gentleman has with the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. CALLAN:

Tell some other jokes.

MR. TULK:

Now I would like for the Montreal Canadian who plays with the Toronto Maple Leafs and says he is not a Toronto Maple Leaf to be quiet. I would like for the hon. gentleman to quiet. What is it? 'You can take what you can get when you can get it.'

MR. EFFORD:

Who said that?

MR. FUREY:

The cigar smoker.

MR. TULK:

The third row benches is a lot better than the second row. He got demoted to the second row on this side, but he was prepared to take a third one on the other side.

Mr. Speaker, we had the personal attacks of the Government House

Leader. We did not hear him say a word about the 18,000 people that have left this Province in 1985 - 1986 - 1987 and up to March 1988.

We are wondering when Brian is going up to the Mainland again and bringing them home? When is he going to make that famous trip that he made? Was it 1979? 1982?

AN HON. MEMBER:
1982.

MR. TULK:
1982, when all those Newfoundlanders had to go to Calgary to work --

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. CALLAN:
They are back at Come by Chance now.

MR. TULK:
In any case, Mr. Speaker, we want Brian, the Premier, our Brian, not their Brian up in Ottawa, we want our Brian to make that trip again and to tell the 18,000 people that have left in the last three years of this administration when and how he is going to bring them home.

We did not hear the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Simms) say very much about the fact that unemployment in March in this Province was 21.9 per cent, not according to Statistics Canada, not according to any outside agency at all, but according to a report that was issued by the Department of Labour.

MR. WELLS:
This Province.

MR. TULK:
This Province, the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador with all

the Tory Blue trimmings on it you can have, that report, the government's own report admitted that there was a 21.9 per cent unemployment problem in the Province. We did not hear anything about that.

We did not hear anything from the Minister of Health (Dr. Collins), the former Minister of Finance. We did not hear anything about him in his two minute speech, about the fact that Newfoundland has the highest retail sales tax in Canada, and he was the gentleman responsible for bringing it in.

We did not hear anything from the Government House Leader, the President of Treasury Board, the man who controls the bucks. We did not hear anything from him about the water and sewer problems in this Province. We did not hear anything about the fact students in this Province have to be out in the streets raising money to buy instructional materials.

We did not hear anything from the hon. gentleman the Minister of Health about the hospital beds that have closed in this Province under this administration. Not a thing.

But they do not mind spending \$165,000 to propagandize a sell out of the Newfoundland Railway. We did not hear anything about that.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. TULK:
Well let me say to the hon. gentleman like this, a Tory, is a Tory is a Tory no odds where he is, whether he is in Ottawa or in Newfoundland and, of course, controlled by Tories, the hon.

gentleman knows it.

One-third contributed by CN, yes, one-third by the feds, one-third by the Province. All with an interest in convincing people that they signed, that they purport to be a good deal was in fact a good deal, when in actual fact everybody, including the hon. gentleman opposite knows that it was a sell out of our constitutional rights that we were granted in 1949.

Mr. Speaker, let me deal with the railway issue. The Government in Ottawa will soon change. As soon as Brian up there gets his nerve to call the election and as soon as Brian down here in Newfoundland gets the nerve up to call an election, we will see a change of government in this Province. There is no doubt about that.

MR. MORGAN:

I believe I heard that before.

MR. TULK:

What has been the commitment? The kind of leadership you need in this Province has already been shown by the Leader of the Opposition, and he is not even yet the Premier, with few of the resources compared to what the Premier has. I think there is something like forty-nine people now working on the eighth floor of Confederation Building, staff for the Premier, or something like that.

MR. SIMMONS:

Getting a salary anyway.

MR. TULK:

Yes, getting the salary is probably more like it. But what do we get the Leader of the Opposition doing? We get him working out a deal with the next

Prime Minister of this country, which is going to see our constitutional rights put back in place.

There is a letter here which I do not believe -

How much time do I have, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:

Four minutes.

MR. TULK:

I do have time to read the letter into the record, and I want to do it. It bears the heading of the leader of the Opposition's office in Ottawa, and it is addressed to the Leader of the Opposition in Newfoundland and it says:

"Further to our recent telephone conversation, I am pleased, on behalf of the Liberal Party of Canada and on behalf of the National Liberal Caucus in Parliament, to indicate my support for the principles contained in the Resolution which you Tabled in the House of Assembly of Newfoundland and Labrador on Tuesday, June 28, 1988."

Mr. Speaker, the Government House Leader got up and put some silly, childish resolution in trying to kill that and would not debate that.

"The agreement reached between the Mulroney Administration in Ottawa and the Peckford Administration in Newfoundland is seriously flawed. The agreement makes no provision for a continuing constitutional obligation by the Government of Canada to cover the additional maintenance and operational costs of the TransCanada Highway in Newfoundland that will result from the closure of the Newfoundland

Railway.

"I have also discussed this very important question for Newfoundland and Labrador with my colleagues, Brian Tobin, Bill Rompkey and George Baker, as well as with my Finance Critic, Raymond Garneau. As you know, Messrs. Tobin, Rompkey and Baker, following your example in the House of Assembly, have now given notice in the House of Commons of a Private Member's Resolution reflecting the terms of our agreement to restore and maintain the Government of Canada's constitutional transportation obligation to the province of Newfoundland and Labrador."

DR. COLLINS:

Sure, they are already there.

MR. TULK:

That is interesting.

"Please be assured of my continued co-operation and commitment to redressing the terrible wrong committed by the Peckford and Mulroney Administrations when they signed the agreement of June 20, 1988 to close the Newfoundland Railway without providing for proper compensation for the province of Newfoundland and Labrador."

And here is the important thing:

"Political necessity must never be a substitute for public policy."

That is what we have seen. I want to Table this letter. That is what we have seen the government of this Province do. In a desperate move to get a few bucks to try and do what they always preached that they can do. It has always been their political creed that you can buy the people of

this Province! You can buy the votes of the people of this Province!

Well, Mr. Speaker, they thought the few bucks they are going to get over the next fifteen years, and as the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) said, 'They did not even get a lump sum.' But they thought that the few bucks they got by selling out constitutional rights, which a former great Liberal in this Province fought for so hard in 1949, the former Premier, Joseph R. Smallwood. They thought, like the Tory Diefenbaker government using Term 29, they could do away with our constitutional rights and get a few bucks to buy the next election.

As I told the Premier in Fogo District in 1985, let me say one thing to you, the government side of this House, you cannot buy, you cannot bribe, and you cannot blackmail the people of this Province. It cannot be done.

I say to the hon. gentleman that this railway deal will make Term 29, and I say to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Windsor), the Upper Churchill which he wants to talk about, will make that look like a Sunday school picnic in terms of what they have done with this railway issue.

Mr. Speaker, there are a couple of other issues I want to address. The Government House Leader and the Minister of Health I think it was, certainly the Government House Leader, suggested that this is the party of doom and gloom, and that we were inconsistent. No, Mr. Speaker, the inconsistency comes from the other side.

Last year we had the former

Minister of Finance, who was probably closer to the truth than this year's Minister of Finance, and the Premier of this Province, tell us that we were bankrupt; that we were close to the dirty thirties in terms of our ability to meet our financial obligations. What does the Budget Speech of last year say? What did the now Minister of Health (Dr. Collins), the former Minister of Finance say?

"For the year immediately before us we anticipate extremely trying and testing circumstances, particularly for the financial status of the government itself and its role as the deliverer of the vast bulk of public services needed by our people."

Mr. Speaker, this year we had the hon. gentleman from Mount Pearl, the present Minister of Finance, stand and say, "We brought this Province soundly through the trying years of recession in the early 1980s, our economic policies have helped this Province to enjoy one of its most prosperous years in 1987."

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

Two different Ministers of Finance from the same government, inconsistent, within twelve months we were facing doom and gloom. The next year, they had done a great job for eight or nine years.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the former Minister spoke the truth. I believe he did because I do not believe that the hon. gentleman is the type of person who does not say what he does not believe.

Mr. Speaker, you ask why we

brought this resolution. The Government House Leader would like to know why the Leader of the Opposition moved a non-confidence vote on the government. I want to ask him a question; I want to ask this Legislature a question.

How could an Opposition have confidence in a government that in our present fishing dispute between Canada and France on a certain Friday were demanding the Government of Canada implement trade sanctions against France because of its treatment of the South Coast fishermen and on the same Friday, I think it was May 6, they themselves, at our instigation, decided that they would also impose trade sanctions against French companies, and then on the next Wednesday did a complete turn around? They said, 'No, the contracts have to be honoured because they are there.' Now how can you have confidence in a government that is that inconsistent?

How can you have confidence in a Premier who in 1979 and 1980 and 1981 told us that we had a constitutional right to a railway in this Province, that it was constitutionally guaranteed and as late as 1984 made the same statement, and in January of 1986 stood before the public of this Province and said, 'I was only posturing, carrying on a deception,' he said, 'that is all I was doing,' to his own people, and in 1988 commits the worse sell-out in the history of Newfoundland?

How can you believe a Premier and a government, how can you have confidence in them that in the 1984 election, September 4, promised, along with Brian Mulroney, to inflict prosperity on

this Province, told us that when there was a PC Government elected in Ottawa all would be well and five months afterwards was looking at not the imposition of one licence for FFTs but the imposition of three without their knowing it? The infliction of prosperity?

How can you have confidence in a government when we saw yesterday the Premier walk into this Legislature and table what he said was great improvements to the Conflict of Interest Guidelines, when in actual fact all the Premier tabled was an out for many of his Cabinet ministers, and many of the people on that side who are now in a conflict of interest position.

Mr. Speaker, is it any wonder when you look at the performance of this government, and I will conclude with this, and when you look at the kinds of things people on that side of the House have been saying, and the kinds of actions they have been carrying out on the other end, that the leader of the Opposition would move a vote of non-confidence. Is it any wonder, when you see a Government House Leader who is willing to put his political expediency of getting money which he can get in another way, which he will use as an excuse, a Government House Leader who will use the people of this Province to get his own way in this Legislature, that you would see somebody move a vote of non-confidence? Mr. Speaker, there is a better day for us. If the Premier is still around, and he has been noticeably absent in the last week, I hope he is preparing for an election.

MR. CALLAN:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

That will be the last clap for the member for Bellevue, I can tell him, whenever he chooses to call it.

The Canadian, when he played as a Canadian, won by 125 votes. The Canadian playing as a Maple leaf will get the soundest defeat of his life.

MR. CALLAN:

He who laughs last, laughs best.

MR. TULK:

I would like to see the laugh on your face after the next election.

Mr. Speaker, whenever they get the nerve, whenever they find the intestinal fortitude to issue the writ, we will have them sit over here and we will sit over there and do the job that needs to be done. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to take a great deal of time to conclude debate on the budget this evening. I want to first of all, however, address the point made a few moments ago by the hon. gentleman, that never before has closure been used on the budget debate, and that the Opposition has not had ample time to debate the 'collections and the expenditures', I think was his terminology. Well, what does he think the debate on the estimates is? For seventy-five hours we did exactly that, we debated the revenues and the expenditures of

government in detail in Committee, with all the officials present, and all the information that was requested. We went through that in great detail, Mr. Speaker, and that has already been approved by this House. The revenues and expenditures have already been agreed to in Committee. To say that we have not had ample opportunity to look at the details of the estimates is nonsense, Mr. Speaker. What we have been listening to for the last number of hours is some political rhetoric which, in most cases, had absolutely nothing to do with the budget; members took the opportunity to talk about a whole range of items, including their district, and that is fair ball, that is what the Budget Debate is all about. It is a general debate, the same as the Throne Speech Debate.

Gentlemen will have an opportunity to carry on with things they have been talking about today and yesterday in the Throne Speech Debate, and perhaps some of the other finance bills. They can get into some general discussions on some of those as well, so there is ample opportunity. What we have never seen before is an Opposition that would deliberately try to hold up passage of the budget so that the legitimate expenditures of government could not be met, particularly payroll and some of the important programs, including, perhaps most importantly this time of the year, with the very short construction season that we have, the capital program for this year which could have been seriously slowed down as a result of any irresponsible opposition to the budget. Having already accepted the items of the budget, to spend time on this aspect of debate, Mr. Speaker, I think, could only be

considered to be irresponsible.

Mr. Speaker, what I want to do is try to summarize and get back to the question of the budget itself, as to exactly what this budget does and what it says, and I want to address the question or the point that has been made in relation to the budget that was delivered by my colleague, the Minister of Health, last year.

Hon. gentlemen may recall, Mr. Speaker, that last year it was charged that the Minister of Finance was overly optimistic, that he was padding the books, that there was no way in the world that the budget he brought down would, in fact, balance at the end of the year. They said he was overly optimistic. This year, because we find out that we, in fact, exceeded his projections, particularly as it relates to revenues - I might point out that he was a percentage of 1 per cent off on the expenditure projections for last year, which is an incredible job, considering you are talking about almost \$3 billion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WINDSOR:

The only difference, Mr. Speaker, in the final estimates of the budget, or the final expenditures and revenues, was on the revenue side. Somethings took place there, and the items that changed, Mr. Speaker, were things that obviously were beyond the control of government to predict, however, not beyond the control of government to influence, such things as retail sales tax. Well, what does that tell you? It tells you, obviously, that there is more disposable income in the Province,

people with more money to spend, and have more confidence in the economy and are prepared to get out there and spend. So expenditures increased by \$26 million, and personal income tax increased by almost \$14 million. Obviously more people are working, more people are earning more money, and, therefore, are paying more taxes. Corporate income taxes are up by \$15 million, and equalization payments are up by \$11.4 million. All of these factors, Mr. Speaker, indicate that the economy has improved.

And what does the Opposition say about that? Well, it is only luck. It was not luck last year when we had to predict a \$172 million deficit. That was bad luck, poor fellows, it is not your fault. But this year it is only luck that we were able to bring that down. Well, I do not think it was luck, Mr. Speaker, I think it is the direct result of the policies and the good management of this government over the past number of years.

It is not luck, Mr. Speaker, that the Rowater Mill was taken over by Kruger and hundreds of people are still working in Corner Brook and the city of Corner Brook is now thriving as much as it ever has been in its history, in spite of the leader of the Opposition.

It is not luck that St. Lawrence mines have been activated, and the Raie Verte mine is on a good, sound footing. It is not luck that Fisheries Products International is now one of the most prosperous and most well-managed fishing corporations in the world. That is not luck, Mr. Speaker. It is not luck that a number of the mining industries around the Province are doing

extremely well. It is not luck that Abitibi-Price is doing well in Grand Falls and in Stephenville as a result of the modernization program. And I could go on and on, Mr. Speaker, about all the things that are not luck, but are a direct result of the actions and the policies of this government.

Come By Chance is a prime example, Mr. Speaker. When a lot of people had given up, this government said no. When the wrecking ball was on the way to Come By Chance, this government said no, it is not acceptable.

MR. SIMMONS:

At your invitation.

MR. WINDSOR:

Not at my invitation. I was in Toronto with Petro-Canada and said, 'No', on behalf of this government, 'this is not going to happen', and three weeks later the Premier was able to put together a deal.

MR. BAIRD:

Ignore him. Cutler will look after him.

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker, what we are seeing this year is a strong improvement in the economy as a result of the actions and the policies of this government, and what we are seeing, so far this year, is a continuation of that trend. The budget we brought down, Mr. Speaker, was fair, it was reasonable, and it is realistic, and that, perhaps, is what the hon. gentlemen do not like. They do not like the fact that business has accepted this budget as being a realistic budget, as being a fair budget. In fact, labour has accepted this budget as being fair and realistic.

They do not like the fact that all of these things are starting to impact very, very positively on the continued economy.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that in discussion we have had recently with the credit rating agencies in New York, they see it as being a very responsible budget, and more importantly perhaps, they see the continued good management that we showed last year as being a continued sign of this government's sincerity in meeting the strong commitments we made, particularly last year, in trying to eliminate that \$172 million deficit. And they see the fact that we are continuing with a measure of restraint this year as a continued sign of good faith and a continued sign of good management, and they have a very strong confidence in this government and our ability to continue to manage the resources and the finances of this Province in a reasonable way.

Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of things that this government has done over the years, and they take time. So I say it is not luck that the economy started to turn around, but many of the policies that this government has instituted over the years have now finally started to bear fruit. This government has continuously put emphasis on management training, on education and training, very strong emphasis, and an increased and improved emphasis over the past several years. Again, when it would be political attractive, I guess, to deal in the short term, this government has consistently dealt in long-term programs and policies that will put the economy on the road to success.

In research and development, Mr. Speaker, when funds that have been made available over the last number of years through federal/provincial agreements could very easily be used on very attractive short-term construction projects that might be politically attractive, our emphasis again has been on research and development, on education and training, and preparing the people and businesses of this Province to take advantage of the opportunities that our natural resources give us. And we have had programs of market and product development, and helping companies in promotion, and a whole range of programs that are dealing with the long term rather than the short term, the kind of shortsightedness that we have seen much too often in the past.

I guess one of the key things, Mr. Speaker, contained in this budget, one of the key initiatives this year, was the Newfoundland Stock Savings Plan and the Venture Capital Tax Credit Program, both of which have been extremely well accepted by the business sector; there is a strong interest in them. Obviously it will take time to get them in place and for companies to begin to take advantage of them, but over the coming months, we feel very strongly that those programs will be a tremendous benefit to many, many companies in this Province, large and small alike, as we try to deal with the problems that I mentioned: First of all, improving the management of co-operations in this Province and, secondly, and probably the most important problem that we face continuously, is a lack of equity infusion, a lack of capital in companies. This is what these programs will do, and this is the

problem that will be overcome by these two programs. I think the business sector will respond, and the challenge is there to them to respond, to the problems they face by taking advantage of the programs that we have put together.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is government's role, to create a climate where business and industry are prepared to invest, a good climate in which to do business. That is really government's role, to facilitate, to assist where possible, to finance where necessary, when difficulties take place, to be there to help corporations to get on their own two feet and to be able to be strong contributors to the economy of our Province.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, I guess I can say that one thing that has been said is that indeed it probably is a good election budget. If you ever wanted to have an election budget, this is probably it. It may well be right. And I think that is why the hon. gentlemen are so concerned, that it might well be an election budget. It might well be an election budget!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. WINDSOR:
This government will have no problem going to the people of this Province with this budget in an election, let me assure you, because it does, indeed, address many of the problems that we are faced with in this Province.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
I cannot do it. I have to have an Opposition. I cannot call an election without an Opposition.

MR. WINDSOR:

Again the Premier is guessing what I was going to say, because I was going to talk about some of the people opposite who would not be here after an election. But I am going to be kind tonight -

MR. DAWE:

It would be a shorter list to talk about the ones who will be here.

MR. WINDSOR:

We have another one of the star candidates advertised here today. There are not many of the star candidates here. A lot of them are looking over their shoulders to see which star candidate is moving into their district. It is going to be interesting to see who moves into the various districts, but I can look around and see some of them.

The hon. member for Waterford Street, he said - did he?

MR. SIMMS:
Watershed.

MR. WINDSOR:

Watershed - Kenmount he called himself today. He has not yet found out where Mount Pearl is, poor fellow. He does not even realize that I announced \$1.5 million for water and sewer, most of which serves his district. He does not even know where his district is. He does not realize how generous we are to the hon. member for Waterford - Kenmount.

Mr. Speaker, I will not belabour the point. I think I have made the important points. I think it is important to recognize that this budget is a good document. It is a document, once again, for the future, not for the short term. If it were an election budget, indeed it would be a lot

sweeter than this. Do not worry!
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
Is the House ready for the question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Yes.

MR. SPEAKER:
All those in favour of the amendment, please say 'aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Aye.

MR. SPEAKER:
All those against the motion please say 'nay'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Nay.

MR. TULK:
Division, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Call in the members.

Division

All those in favour of the amendment, please rise:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Wells), Mr. Efford, the hon. Mr. Simmons, Mr. Tulk, Mr. W. Carter, Mr. Gilbert, Mr. Furey, Mr. Lush, Mr. Gullage, Mr. Long.

MR. SPEAKER:
All those against the amendment, please rise:

The hon. the Premier, the hon. the Minister of Finance and Minister

Responsible for Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro (Mr. Windsor), the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout), the hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services (Dr. Twomey), the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Brett), the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources (Mr. R. Aylward), the hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Power), the hon. the President of Treasury Board and President of the Council (Mr. Simms), the hon. the Minister of Health (Dr. Collins), the hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Dawe), the hon. the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Doyle), the hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications (Mr. Young), the hon. the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Matthews), the hon. the Minister of Environment and Lands (Mr. Russell), the hon. the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard), the hon. the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Tobin), the hon. the Minister responsible for Northern Development (Mr. Warren), the hon. the Minister responsible for Newfoundland and Labrador Housing (Mr. Peach), Mr. Parsons, Mr. Greening, Mr. Reid, Mr. J. Carter, Mr. Baird, Mr. Hodder, Mr. Woodford, Mr. Callan, Mr. Patterson.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The vote is ten for the amendment and twenty-seven against. I declare the amendment defeated.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The motion is that I now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means.

On motion, that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order!

The hon. The President of the Council.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion, that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. GREENING:
Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred, have directed me to report having made progress, and ask leave to sit again.

On motion, report received and adopted, Committee ordered to sit again presently, by leave.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Finance.

Mr. Speaker, I have a message from His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

MR. SPEAKER:
Government House, St. John's, Newfoundland, May 11, 1988.

The Hon. The Minister of Finance.

I, the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Newfoundland, transmit estimates of sums required for the Public Service of the Province for the year ending the 31st. day of March 1989, by way of further supply and in accordance with the Provisions of the Constitution Act, 1867, I recommend these estimates to the House of Assembly.

James A. McGrath
Lieutenant-Governor.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. SIMMS:
I move that the message be referred to a Committee of the Whole on Supply.

On motion, that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Supply, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Committee of the Whole on Supply

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order!

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Chairman, I move that the total contained in the estimates be carried and that a resolution be adopted to give effect to the same.

Motion, that the total contained in the estimates be carried, carried.

On motion, that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. GREENING:

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole on Supply have considered the matters to them referred and have passed the amount of \$1,640,280,400 contained in the estimates and ask leave to sit again.

On motion, report received and adopted, Committee ordered to sit again, presently, by leave.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. SIMMS:

I move that the report of the Committee of the Whole on Supply with respect to the estimates of 1988-89, together with a resolution and a bill consequent thereto, be referred to a Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means and that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair.

On motion, that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Committee of the Whole

Resolution

That it is expedient to introduce a measure to provide for the granting to Her Majesty for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service for the financial year ending the 31st day of March, 1989, the sum of one billion six hundred and forty million two hundred and eighty thousand four hundred dollars (\$1,640,280,400).

On motion, resolution carried.

On motion, clauses 1 though 3 carried.

On motion, schedule carried.

A bill, "An Act For Granting To Her Majesty Certain Sums Of Money For Defraying Certain Expenses Of The Public Service For The Financial Year Ending The Thirty-First Day Of March One Thousand Nine Hundred And Eighty-Nine And For Other Purposes Relating To The Public Service."

On motion, that the Committee rise and report having passed a resolution and a bill consequent thereto, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

On motion, report received and adopted, resolution ordered read a first and second time, bill ordered read a first, second and third time.

On motion, Resolution read a first and second time.

On motion, a bill, "An Act For Granting To Her Majesty Certain Sums Of Money For Defraying Certain Expenses Of The Public Service For The Financial Year Ending The Thirty-First day Of March One Thousand Nine Hundred

And Eighty-Nine And For Other Purposes Relating To The Public Service", read a first, second and third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill No. 40).

MR. SIMMS:

Well, Mr. Speaker, having concluded the business of the day thus far, and having passed the Budget, I thank hon. members for their support and co-operation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

I am sorry we were unable to get His Honour. We tried to contact him, but he was at another function. Of course, we were not sure what time we would be finishing, so Your Honor will have somebody bring the bill down to Government House for signature immediately after the closing of the House.

We did have an intention of sitting until one o'clock, but I suppose that would be too harsh. It would be wishing too much if I asked hon. members to continue on with a bit more discussion. Would that be unfair? Perhaps it might be a bit unfair, because the next item of business would be the finance motions. That is the normal item of business that would carry on after.

MR. WELLS:

It is all right with us.

MR. SIMMS:

Well, your finance critic is not here.

MR. WELLS:

What does the government want to do?

MR. SIMMS:

We would like to carry on. The next order of business would normally be the finance motions that follow. Your finance critic is not here, so maybe it might be a bit unfair. Perhaps we will leave it until Monday, to give hon. members an opportunity to be prepared.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMS:

Could we then make an agreement?

MR. LONG:

No, our finance critic is not here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

Considering all the respect I have for the hon. member, I am prepared to indicate to the House that we really do not have an agreement, or leave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMS:

That is very unfortunate. We are quite prepared to proceed.

MR. LONG:

No leave.

MR. SIMMS:

No leave?

MR. LONG:

No.

MR. SIMMS:

That is very unfortunate, Mr. Speaker.

Let the record show that the government was prepared to proceed with further business. Anyway,

Mr. Speaker, for the information of hon. members, on Monday we will be calling the finance motions that normally follow the budget.

Our intention then, for the information of hon. members, just so you will have a general idea of what our intention is following that, because this House is continuing to do its work and do things we wish to do, after we finish the finance motions, however long that takes and whenever it is, we intend to move on to Meach Lake as our next item of business. Then we will carry on with whatever legislation is left to do.

Since I have the last minute, I congratulate the Minister of Finance and wish him very well over the weekend in Mount Pearl, and I move that the House adjourn until tomorrow, Monday, at two of the clock and that this House do now adjourn.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Monday, July 4, 1988 at 2:00 p.m.

[CONTINUED]

Premier Peckford.....PC.....Green Bay
Mr. Power.....PC.....Ferryland
Mr. Reid.....PC.....Trinity-Bay de Verde
Mr. Rideout.....PC.....Baie Verte-White Bay
Mr. Russell.....PC.....Lewisporte
Hon. Mr. Simmons.....Lib.....Fortune-Hermitage
Mr. Simms.....PC.....Grand Falls
Mr. Tobin.....PC.....Burin-Placentia West
Mr. Tulk.....Lib.....Fogo
Dr. Twomey.....PC.....Exploits
Ms. Verge.....PC.....Humber East
Mr. Warren.....PC.....Torngat Mountains
Mr. Wells.....Lib.....Windsor-Buchans
Mr. Windsor.....PC.....Mount Pearl
Mr. Woodford.....PC.....Humber Valley
Mr. Young.....PC.....Harbour Grace

THE MINISTRY:

Premier A. Brian Peckford.....Energy
Mr. R. Alyward.....Forest Resources
Mr. Barrett.....Development and Tourism
Mr. Blanchard.....Labour
Mr. Brett.....Municipal Affairs
Mr. Butt.....Culture, Recreation and Youth
Dr. Collins.....Health and Deputy Premier
Mr. Dawe.....Intergovernmental Affairs
Mr. Dinn.....Mines
Mr. Doyle.....Transportation
Mr. Matthews.....Career Development and Advanced Studies
Mr. Peach.....Minister Responsible for Housing
Mr. Power.....Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development
Mr. Rideout.....Fisheries
Mr. Russell.....Environment and Lands
Mr. Simms.....President of the Executive Council
President of Treasury Board
Government House Leader
Mr. Tobin.....Social Services
Dr. Twomey.....Public Works and Services
Ms. Verge.....Justice
Mr. Warren...Minister Responsible for Northern Development
Mr. Windsor.....Finance
Minister Responsible for Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro
Mr. Young.....Consumer Affairs and Communications

CONTENTS

THURSDAY, 30 JUNE, 1988.

<u>Point of Order on procedure:</u>	
Mr. Tulk, Mr. Simms.....	3723
Mr. Speaker, rules No Point of Order.....	3724

Statements by Ministers

<u>Private Sector Employment Program Update:</u>	
Mr. Matthews.....	3724
Mr. Efford.....	3724

<u>Support for Fishing Operations:</u>	
Mr. Rideout.....	3725
Mr. W. Carter.....	3726

Oral Questions

<u>Fowler Report:</u>	
Will government seek compensation from CN.	
Mr. Furey, Dr. Collins.....	3727

Will government seek compensation for damage to Catamaran Park. Mr. Furey, Dr. Collins.....	3728
--	------

Will government act on report's recommendations. Mr. Furey, Dr. Collins.....	3728
---	------

<u>Sprung Project:</u>	
Is it government policy to ignore non-payment of subcontractors. Mr. Kelland, Mr. Power.....	3729

Contends government has a moral obligation to see subcontractors are paid. Mr. Kelland, Mr. Power.....	3729
--	------

Is government not concerned about non-payment. Mr. Kelland, Mr. Power.....	3730
---	------

Caplin Fishery:

Possibility of extending season.
Mr. W. Carter, Mr. Rideout.....3731

Contending that Japan wants more caplin than
the quota allows and additional markets are
available, asks that season be extended.
Mr. W. Carter, Mr. Rideout.....3732

Minister's recent initiatives to identify
new markets. Mr. W. Carter, Mr. Rideout.....3732

Contends the season was open before the
caplin were ripe. Mr. Efford, Mr. Rideout.....3733

Contends the minister at fault for opening
the season too early. Mr. Efford, Mr. Rideout.....3734

Contends the minister and Ottawa should
impose regulations to protect fishermen.
Mr. Efford, Mr. Rideout.....3733

When will the fishermen know what new markets
they can access. Mr. Tulk, Mr. Rideout.....3736

South Africa:

Ministerial awareness of officials of South
Africa meeting with local private citizens.
Mr. Long, Mr. Dawe.....3735

Have the managers of the province's pooled
pensions and other funds been instructed not
to invest in South African companies.
Mr. Long, Mr. Dawe.....3736

Northeast Coast Storm Damage:

Fishermen dissatisfied with assessments and
compensation. Mr. Lush, Mr. Rideout.....3738

Contends fishermen lacked funds to avail of
the replacement program. Mr. Lush, Mr. Rideout.....3739

Notices of Motion

Supplementary Supply:

Mr. Windsor.....3740

Answers to Questions for which Notice has been Given

Food Services at Central Newfoundland Hospital:

Dr. Collins.....3740

Orders of the Day

Motion 11, that Budget Debate Continue:

Mr. Simms, moves motion.....3741

Carried, on Division, 25 to 14.....3742

The Budget Debate resumes:

Mr. Wells.....3742

Mr. Simms.....3750

Mr. Kelland.....3758

Mr. Efford.....3764

Mr. J. Carter, adjourns debate.....3772

Committee of the Whole
on Ways and Means

Mr. Simms, moves Committee report progress.....3823

Committee of the Whole
on Supply

Mr. Simms, moves Estimates be Adopted.....3823

Committee of the Whole

On motion, Budget Resolution, carried.....3824

Adjournment Motion.....3826

Debate on the Adjournment
[Late Show]

The Newfoundland Railway Closure:

Mr. Gilbert.....	3773
Mr. Dawe.....	3775

South Africa:

Mr. Long.....	3775
Mr. Dawe.....	3777

Caplin Fishery:

Mr. Efford.....	3778
Mr. Rideout.....	3779

On motion, Adjournment postponed.....	3781
---------------------------------------	------

(Evening)

The House resumed sitting at 7 p.m.....	3782
Mr. J. Carter, resumes debate.....	3782
Mr. Baker.....	3783
Dr. Collins.....	3789
Mr. Gullage.....	3790
Mr. Fenwick.....	3795
Mr. Lush.....	3802
Mr. Tulk.....	3808
Mr. Windsor, closing debate.....	3817
Non-confidence motion, defeated on Division 27 to 10...	3882